



Columbia University
in the City of New York

THE LIBRARIES



THE
HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND.

VOL. VIII.

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIFT,

FOR

WILLIAM PATERSON, EDINBURGH.

THE

HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND.

VOL. VIII.

EDINBURGH: WILLIAM PATERSON.

1879.

CONTAINING AN

ACCOUNT OF THE ROMANS, OF THE BRITAINS BETWIXT THE
WALLS, OF THE CALEDONIANS OR PICTS, AND
PARTICULARLY OF THE SCOTS.

WITH AN APPENDIX OF ANCIENT MANUSCRIPT PIECES.

BY

THOMAS INNES, M.A.

REPRINTED FROM THE ORIGINAL EDITION PUBLISHED IN 1729.
WITH A MEMOIR BY GEORGE GRUB, LL.D.

EDINBURGH: WILLIAM PATERSON.

1879.

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|--|--|
| MEMOIR, | xiii |
| THE PREFACE, | 1 |
| THE INTRODUCTION AND DIVISION OF THIS ESSAY, | 21 |
| BOOK I. | |
| AN ACCOUNT OF THE ROMANS, OF THE MIDLAND BRITAINS OR MÆATS, AND OF THE CALEDONIANS OR PICTS, IN THE NORTHERN PARTS OF BRITAIN OR SCOTLAND, | 25 |
| CHAPTER I. | |
| Of the Romans in Britain, | 25 |
| Art. 1. Of the Settlement of the Romans in Britain, and Divisions of it into Provinces, | 25 |
| Art. 2. Of the Roman Walls in Britain, 1. Of Julius Agricola's Fences, 2. Of the Emperor Adrian's Wall, A.D. 121, 3. Of that of Lollinus Urbicus, A.D. 138, 4. Of Severns' Wall, A.D. 210, 5. Of Carausius, 6. Of the Fences made, A.D. 367, by the General Theodosius, 7. Of Stilicho's Fences, A.D. 398, 8. Of the Wall repaired A.D. 421, 9. Of the last Wall, A.D. 426, | 27 27 27 28 28 32 32 32 32 33 |
| CHAPTER II. | |
| Of the Britains in Scotland, or Midland Britains, | 36 |
| Art. 1. State of the Midland Britains in the Roman times, | 36 |
| Art. 2. Of the Kingdom of the Midland Britains, | 38 |
| Art. 3. The Walenses, or remains of the Midland Britains in the Western Parts of Scotland, incorporated with the Scots, | 40 |
| CHAPTER III. | |
| Of the Caledonians or Picts, | 42 |
| Art. 1. Of the Antiquity of the Settlement of the Picts in Britain ; that they were the same as the Caledonians, and the most Ancient and first known Inhabitants of the Northern Parts of the Island, | 42 |
| Art. 2. Of the Occasion of the Name of Picts given to the Caledonians or Britains of the North, | 43 |
| Art. 3. Of the Origin of the Caledonians or Picts, and from whence they first came into Britain, | 54 |

| | PAGE |
|---|----------|
| Art. 4. Of the Pictish Language, | 58 |
| Art. 5. Of the Extent of the Pictish Dominions, | 61 |
| Sec. 1. Extent of the Caledonian or Pictish Dominions to the North ; that they reached to the extremities of the North of Scotland, or northern parts of Britain, | 62 |
| Sec. 2. Extent of the Pictish Dominions towards the South, on this side of the Friths of Clyde and Forth, | 68 |
| Art. 6. Of the Nature or Form of the Pictish Government, | 70 |
| Art. 7. Of the Antiquity of the Pictish Monarchy, and of the Number and Series of their Kings, | 72 |
| Irish Account of them, | 72 |
| Of the <i>Chronica de Origine Antiquorum Pictorum</i> , | 74 |
| Scottish Account of them, | 75 |
| Series or Succession of the Pictish Kings—First Part, Second Part, | 89 91 |
| Art. 7. Of the Union of the Pictish and Scotish Kingdoms in one Monarchy, | 93 |
| Art. 9. That the present Inhabitants of Scotland are as well the Offspring and Race of the Piets as of the Scots, | 95 |

BOOK II.

| | |
|--|-----|
| OF THE SCOTS, | 106 |
| INTRODUCTION AND DIVISION OF THIS SECOND BOOK, | 106 |

SECTION I.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Of the Antiquity of the Settlement and Monarchy of the Scots in Britain, upon Supposition of the Certainty or Probability of the High Anti- quities of Ireland ; together with a full Discussion of the Story of the Forty Ancient Kings before Fergus, Son of Erch, | 108 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER I.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Of the Debates of the Scotish and Irish Writers about the Antiquity of the Settlement of the Scots in Britain : that the Present Inhab- itants of Scotland ought to be very indifferent about the issue of these Debates ; and that the Irish are more interested to maintain the Ancient Settlement of the Scots in Britain than the Scots them- selves, | 109 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|-----|
| That if the Settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland, twelve or thirteen Ages before the Incarnation, be once admitted, that of the Scots in Britain, before the Romans entered it, will follow in course, as being supported by proofs of the same nature, | 114 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|--|
| Of the Government of the Scots in Britain, upon Supposition of their Ancient Settlement ; Discussion of the various Accounts of the Scotish | |
|--|--|

CONTENTS.

ix

| | PAGE |
|---|--------------------------|
| Historians concerning the Government and Kings of the Scots in Britain before King Fergus, the Son of Erech, | 122 |
| Art. 1. Of the Account given by John Fordun and his Followers concerning the Kings of the Scots in Britain before the Reign of Fergus (called the Second), Son of Erch, | 123 |
| Art. 2. Of Hector Boece, and his Account of the first Forty Kings of the Scots in Britain, | 130 |
| See. 1. Of Hector Boece, and his History in general, | 132 |
| See. 2. Of the Vouchers or Authorities on which H. Boece's History is grounded, | 132 |
| Of Bower, | 132 |
| Of Elphinston, | 132 |
| Of Turgot, | 133 |
| Of Veremundus, | 133 |
| See. 3. Proof First against the Vouchers of Boece's History : the Silence of all former Writers, | 135 |
| See. 4. Proof Second against Boece's History : the most part of the Names of his Forty Kings forged upon Names of the Old Genealogy, and a New Genealogy drawn up, | 140 |
| Genealogical Tables of the Kings of Scots, in which the Old Genealogy is compared to Boece's New Draft of it, | 140 |
| Account and Authority of the Old Genealogy, | 144 |
| See. 5. Proof Third against Boece's History : the Forty Kings' Names forged upon corrupted Names of the Old Genealogy in or near Boece's time, | 146 |
| See. 6. Proof Fourth : Boece's History stuffed with Fables, | 148 |
| See. 7. Proof Fifth : New Principles of Government, | 149 |
| See. 8. Principles of Scottish Government according to the Old Laws of Scotland, | 151 |
| See. 9. Right of the Scottish Monarchy according to Old Histories, . Occasion and Growth of Popular Power over the King, . Rebellion against King James III. Act of Debate of the Field of Striving, . Veremund's History forged to serve a turn, . | 152 160 163 166 |
| Art. 3. Of John Lesly, Bishop of Ross, and his History of Scotland, | 169 |
| Art. 4. Of David Chambers of Ormond, his Abridgment of the Scotish History, and Citations from Veremund, | 171 |
| Art. 5. Of George Buchanan's Account of the first Forty Kings of the Scots in Britain, | 176 |
| See. 1. The Introduction to Buchanan's History ; the Progress of the Doctrine of the Depositing Power in Scotland, | 176 |
| See. 2. Of M. George Buchanan ; of his Writings against his Sovereign, Mary Queen of Scotland, | 181 |
| See. 3. Of Buchanan's History of the Scots, | 205 |
| Sec. 4. (1) That Buchanan had no other Ground nor Authority for all that he hath set down in his Fourth Book (over and above what Fordun contains) of the Names, Lives, and Reigns of the first Forty Kings, than Boece's History, | 209 |
| See. 5. (2) That Buchanan was persuaded that all that Boece had written of these first Forty Kings (over and above what is in | |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Fordun) was fabulous, and without any probable ground, and deserved no credit, | 209 |
| Sec. 6. (3) That notwithstanding Buchanan himself did not believe the Accounts that Boece gave of the first Forty Kings (as we have seen), yet he did all that lay in his power to render them credible, and wrote his own History with that design, | 215 |
| Sec. 7. (4) Buchanan's chief intention in writing his History was to support the Principles of Government of his Dialogue <i>De Jure Regni</i> , or the Subjects' Power to Depose and Punish their Kings, | 218 |
| CHAPTER IV. | |
| Conclusion of this First Section, | 223 |
| SECTION 2. | |
| An Inquiry into the Antiquity of the First Settlement of the Scots in Ireland and in the Northern Parts of Britain, | 226 |
| DISSERTATION I. | |
| On the Account that the Irish give of the Remote Antiquities of Ireland, and of the First Settlement of the Scots in that Island, | 226 |
| CHAPTER I. | |
| Containing the Difficulties and Doubts which occur in the Particular Accounts that the Modern Irish Writers, such as Keating, O'Flaherty, and others, give, on the credit of their Bards and Seanachies, of the Remote or High Antiquities of Ireland, | 231 |
| Art. 1. A Short Account of the Irish Remote Antiquities—First Objection, | 232 |
| Art. 2. The Second Objection, drawn from the means by which the Irish pretend that their High Antiquities were preserved and conveyed down ; and of their Ancient Literature and Polity before the times of Christianity, | 235 |
| Art. 3. That the Inhabitants of Ireland were still unpolished and barbarous, and, by consequence, without the use of Letters, in the first Ages of Christianity, according to all the Accounts that we have of them from the most Ancient Writers, and in the Opinion of the most Learned among the Modern, | 239 |
| Art. 4. That in all appearance the use of Letters was not introduced into Ireland till the Preaching of the Gospel among them in the Fifth Century of Christianity, | 246 |
| Art. 5. That even supposing that the Irish had the use of Letters before the Gospel was preached among them, their pretended Ancient Writers, the Bards, deserve no credit, | 259 |
| Sec. 1. Of the Bards in general, | 259 |
| Sec. 2. Of the Irish Bards, | 262 |
| Art. 6. The Uncertainty of the Remote Antiquities of Ireland appears by the contradictory Accounts given of them, and the many Alterations made in them by posterior Writers, | 265 |

CONTENTS.

xi

PAGE

| | |
|--|-----|
| Art. 7. That the Irish shunning to publish their pretended Ancient Original Histories or Chronicles, such as they are, without addition or retrenchment, gives a just ground to suspect the credit of them, and of the Remote Antiquities built upon them, | 276 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|-----|
| That supposing even the certainty or probability of the Ancient Settlement and Monarchy of the Milesians in Ireland, or in general that of the Irish Remote Antiquities, yet it does not follow that these Milesians were properly Scots ; but that, on the contrary, it seems certain that the Scots were not settled in Ireland till about the time of the Incarnation, or rather after it, | 279 |
| Answer to Objections, | 287 |

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Of the Origin of the Scots, of their Name, and of the Time of their Settlement in Ireland, | 294 |
|--|-----|

DISSERTATION II.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Of the Writers of the Scottish History, of the Time of the First Settlement of the Scots, and of the Beginning of their Monarchy in Britain, | 299 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER I.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Of the Writers of the Scottish History, | 300 |
| Art. 1. Of the Writers of the Scottish History in general, | 300 |
| Art. 2. Of the many Disasters befallen the Monuments of the Scottish History in past Ages, | 301 |
| Sec. 1. Of Casual Accidents, | 302 |
| Sec. 2. Destruction of our Historical Monuments by King Edward I., | 302 |
| Sec. 3. Destruction of Historical and other Ancient Monuments at the Scotish Reformation, | 307 |
| Chronological Index of such of the National Councils of the Church of Scotland as I have found mentioned in History and Records, | 320 |
| Art. 3. An Account of the Monuments, Writers, and Records of the Scotish History that yet remain, | 325 |
| Sec. 1. Containing such Remains as we have of our Ancient History written before the year 1291, | 326 |
| Sec. 2. Of Records or Monuments of our Ancient History, written since the year 1291, and before the publishing Fordun's Chronicle, | 333 |
| Sec. 3. Of John Fordun, of his Continuators and Followers, and other Writers of our Ancient History, till the year 1526, | 343 |
| Sec. 4. Our Fourth Class of Scotish Writers ; of Boece, Buchanan, and their Followers, | 345 |

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Of the True Epoch of the First Settlement of the Scots, and Beginning of their Monarchy in Britain, | 345 |
| Art. 1. Of the First Settlement of the Scots in Britain, | 346 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Art. 2. Of the First King of the Scots in Britain, | 360 |
| Art. 3. Of the Time of the Beginning of the Reign of Fergus, Son of Erch, and proper Epoch of the Monarchy of the Scots in Britain, | 372 |

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Of the different Steps and Degrees by which the High Antiquities of the Scots grew up by length of time, in the several hands through which they passed, into the Plan of History in which they were afterwards delivered by Modern Writers, | 375 |
| Sec. 1. First step or foundation of the High Antiquities of the Scots in Britain : the opinion of the Scots having been settled in Ireland several Ages before the Incarnation, | 378 |
| Sec. 2. The Settlement of the Scots in Britain placed before the Incarnation, but no Kings till Fergus, Son of Erch, | 379 |
| Sec. 3. First rise or origin of the opinion of Ancient Kings of the Scots in Britain before the Incarnation, but nothing yet determined as to their Number or Names, | 381 |
| Sec. 4. The Number of those Ancient Kings first mentioned, but no account as yet of their Names, not even that of the first King or Founder of the Monarchy, nor the time of the Beginning of the Monarchy as yet fixed, | 383 |
| Sec. 5. John Fordun's labours in the Remote Antiquities of the Scots : Antiquities reduced into a fixed plan and chronological order, | 388 |
| CONCLUSION. | |
| Sec. 6. Growth of these Antiquities by the labours of H. Boece and Buchanan, | 406 |

APPENDIX OF ANCIENT PIECES.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Catalogue of the Kings of Scots, | 410 |
| 1. De Situ Albanie, que in se Figuram Hominis habet, quomodo fuit primitus in Septem Regionibus Divisa, quibusque Nominibus Antiquitus sit vocata, et a quibus inhabitata, | 411 |
| 2. Cronica de Origine Antiquorum Pictorum, | 413 |
| 3. Excerpta ex veteri Chronicō de Regibus Scottorum a Kenetho Mac-Alpin ad Kenethum Mac-Malcolm, | 416 |
| 4. Chronicā Regum Scottorum, ccc. et iiiij. Annorum, | 418 |
| 5. Nomina Regum Scottorum et Pictorum, | 421 |
| 6. Breve Chronicō Scoticum sive Chronicō Rythmicum, | 425 |
| 7. Extract of the Chronicle of Andrew Winton, Prior of Lochleven, | 431 |
| 8. Instrumentum publicum, continens copiam et exemplar de verbo in verbum quarundam literarum Edwardi regis Anglie super renuntiatione et quieta clamatione omnium obligationum, jurium, pactorum et conventorum factorum inter reges Scotie et Anglie, aut suorum regnorū status, super subjectione et jurisclamio regis Scotie et ipsius regni. Et res est bene notanda, | 434 |
| ADDITION. | |
| 9. The Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Striveling, | 438 |
| 10. Rescriptum Innocentii pape VIII. quo facultatem impertit absolvendi eos qui in Jacobum regem III. insurrexerant et de perpetrato crimen ab intimis se dolere protestabantur, &c., | 439 |

M E M O I R.¹

LITTLE is known of the life of Thomas Innes, the author of the *Critical Essay on the Ancient Inhabitants of Scotland*, and of the *Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*. I will incorporate, in these prefatory remarks, the substance of what has already been given in the only biographical notices² of which I am aware, and will add any further information which I have been able to obtain.

Thomas Innes was born at Drumgask, in the parish of Aboyne and county of Aberdeen, in the year 1662. He was the second son of James Innes, wadsetter of Drumgask, by his wife Jane Robertson, daughter of — Robertson, merchant in Aberdeen.³ The family of Drumgask was descended from the Inneses of Drainie, in the county of Moray. The father of Thomas Innes held Drumgask in mortgage from the Earl of Aboyne, but it afterwards became the irredeemable property of the family. James Innes of Drumgask appears in the lists of the Commissioners of Supply named for the sheriffdom of Aberdeen in the first Parliament of King James VII., and in the Convention of Estates in 1689.⁴ As he was a conscientious member of the Church of Rome, it is not likely that he acted on the latter of these occasions. In the Parliament of King James he was, with several others, exempted by name from taking the oath of

¹ The following Memoir appeared for the most part in Innes' *Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, published by the Spalding Club.

² These are the following:—First, the Life of Thomas Innes in Chambers's Biographical Dictionary of Eminent Scotsmen, 1st edit. vol. iii. pp. 182-186; second, a notice in the Preface to the second volume of the Miscellany of the Spalding Club, pp. cxiv.-cxxi.; third, a notice in the Preface to the Chartulary of the Church of Glasgow, pp. vi.-viii.

³ The date of Thomas Innes' birth is mentioned on the fly-leaf of a missal belonging to the late family of Ballogie. He himself alludes to Aboyne as the parish of his birth, in his History, p. 301, at the conclusion of his remarks on S. Adamnan, to whom the parish church was dedicated.

⁴ Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, vol. viii. p. 463, and vol. ix. p. 272.

supremacy and the test.¹ A letter from him to his eldest son Lewis, dated 7th May 1683, is printed in the second volume of the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club. It conveys a very agreeable impression of the writer, and shows the religious principle and mutual affection which bound together the family of Drumgask.

In 1677, Thomas Innes, then fifteen years of age, was sent to Paris, and pursued his studies at the College of Navarre. He entered the Scots College on the 12th of January 1681, but still attended the College of Navarre.² On the 26th of May 1684 he received the clerical tonsure, and on the 10th March 1691 was promoted to the priesthood. After this he went to Notre Dame des Vertues, a seminary of the Oratorians, near Paris, where he continued for two or three months. Returning to the Scots College in 1692, he assisted the principal, his elder brother Lewis, in arranging the records of the Church of Glasgow,³ which had been deposited partly in that college, partly in the Carthusian monastery at Paris, by Archbishop James Beaton. In 1694 he took the degree of Master of Arts in the University of Paris, and in the following year was matriculated in the German nation.⁴

After officiating as a priest for two years in the parish of Magnay, in the diocese of Paris, he came again to the Scots College in 1697. In the spring of 1698 he returned to his native country, and officiated for three years at Inveravon as a priest of the Scottish Mission.⁵ The church at Inveravon was the prebend of the chancellor of the diocese of Murray, and he alludes to this circumstance, and to his three years' residence in that parish, in his dissertation on the reception of the Use of Sarum by the Church of Scotland.⁶ He again went to Paris in October 1701, and became Prefect of Studies in the Scots College, and mission agent.⁷

I have been unable to trace any external change in the con-

¹ Wodrow's History, Burns' edit. vol. iv. p. 347.

² Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. cxvi. There is in the library at Blairs a copy of Dion Cassius, awarded to him by the College of Navarre, 19th August 1681, for a Greek oration.

³ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 370. Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, Preface, p. vi.

⁴ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. cxvi.

⁶ Ibid. p. 366.

⁵ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid. p. cxvi.

dition of Thomas Innes for more than twenty years after the event last mentioned. He was no doubt occupied in the quiet discharge of his duties, and in those literary pursuits by which his name is now known. One circumstance appears to have caused him considerable uneasiness. He fell, with some, under the suspicion of Jansenism. There is no evidence of any formal accusation having been made against him;¹ but in France, in the beginning of last century, the mere suspicion of Jansenism was enough to cause serious injury to a clergyman, not only in popular estimation, but with the authorities in Church and State. His known intimacy with Rollin, Duguet, and Santeul may probably have given rise to the suspicion. He himself was much vexed in consequence; and, in the year 1720, his brother Lewis, in what appears to have been a formal letter to the vicar-general of the Bishop of Apt, contradicted a report that he had concurred in the appeal to a General Council against the condemnation of Quesnel's *Moral Reflections* by Pope Clement XI.² There is no appearance of Jansenism in his historical works, although they mark clearly his decided opposition to Ultra-montanism.

After a long absence he again visited his native country. The object of his visit was probably to collect materials for his *Essay* and his *History*. I have not ascertained the date of his leaving France, or how long he continued in Britain. It is known that he was in Edinburgh during the winter of 1724, and that he had come thither through England. This appears from a notice in the *Analecta* of Wodrow,³ whose curiosity was naturally excited by the appearance of a Roman Catholic priest from abroad. This notice is valuable, and may be given at length:—

There is one Father Innes, a priest, brother to Father Innes of the Scots College at Paris, who has been in Edinburgh all this winter, and mostly in the Advocates' Library, in the hours

¹ The statement quoted in the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club, vol. ii. p. cxviii., is avowedly destitute of much authority, and, in point of time, is irreconcilable with the true order of events in Innes' life, unless James II. be a mistake for James III.

² Spalding Club *Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. cxvii.

³ *Analecta*, vol. iii. pp. 516, 517. These passages are quoted, although not altogether at full length, in Chambers's *Biographical Dictionary*, vol. iii. p. 183 and in the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club, vol. ii. pp. cxviii., cxix.

when open, looking books and manuscripts. He is not engaged in polities, so far as can be guessed, and is a monkish, bookish person, who meddles with nothing but literature. I saw him at Edinburgh. He is upon a design to write an account of the first settlement of Christianity in Scotland, as Mr. Ruddiman informs me, and pretends to show that Scotland was Christianized at first from Rome, and thinks to answer our ordinary arguments against this from the difference between the keeping of Easter from the custom of Rome ; and pretends to prove that there were many variations as to the day of Easter, even at Rome ; and that the usages in Scotland, pretended to be from the Greek Church, are very agreeable to the Romish customs, and, he thinks, were used by the popes about the time which he gives account of our difference as to Easter.

‘ This Father Innes, in a conversation with my informer, my Lord Grange, made an observation which, I fear, is too true. In conversation with the company, who were all Protestants, he said he did not know what to make of those who had separated from the Catholic Church : as far as he could observe generally, they were leaving the foundations of Christianity, and scarce deserved the name of Christians. He heard that there were departures and great looseness in Holland ; that, as he came through England, he found most of the bishops there gone off from their Articles, and gone into Dr. Clarke’s scheme ; that the Dissenters were, many of them, falling much in with the same methods and coming near them ; and that he was glad to find his countrymen in Scotland not tainted in the great doctrine of the Trinity, and sound. Some in the company said, it seems he had not heard of what was thrown up here as to Mr. Simson. He said he knew it, but the ministers were taking him to task and mauling him for his departure from the faith.’

As has been said, the duration of his sojourn in Britain on this occasion has not been ascertained. Either now or at other times he must have made a stay of considerable length. His *Essay*, his *History*, and his manuscript collections show that he had carefully examined the chief public and private repositories of books and manuscripts connected with his subject, both in England and in Scotland. In his letter to ‘ The King,’ transmitting the newly published volumes of his *Critical Essay*,

he speaks of having spent many years in the search and examination into all he could hear of within Great Britain of the remains of what related to the history and antiquities of Scotland.¹ It would evidently, however, be incorrect to suppose that he had spent many years within Britain in this search. Most of his authorities were to be found in the Continental libraries, then untouched by the spoiler; indeed, he drew from thence important materials, which no library in our island could have supplied him with; and he might have obtained copies of documents in this country, which his visit in 1724 enabled him to verify more accurately. The words used by him in the extract from Wodrow, in reference to the heretical opinions entertained by many of the bishops in England, imply that he had not been long in that kingdom previous to his coming to Scotland. While in his native country at this time, he appears to have gone northward as far as Aberdeen. This, at least, is the most natural meaning to be attached to his own words. In his sketch of the life of Boece, he speaks of 'much search at Aberdeen'² as to how long that writer survived the publication of his *History*. In his *Dissertation on the Use of Sarum*, he mentions that he had seen the St. Andrews missal, belonging to Lord Arbuthnot.³ The missal might, no doubt, have been sent to him at Edinburgh, as the chartularies of St. Andrews and Brechin, and other valuable works in the possession of the Earl of Panmure, appear to have been.⁴ That he went farther north than Edinburgh is certain, as he refers to an ancient breviary and missal which he had seen at Drummond Castle.⁵ He had, at all events, returned to Paris before December 1727, at which time he was appointed Vice-Principal of the Scots College; but he must have been again in London while his *Essay* was in the course of being printed, as he refers, in the second paragraph of his letter above mentioned, to the danger to which he would personally have been exposed at that time had the object of his work been fully explained.⁶ The *Essay* was published in London in 1729, and in the course of that year he was once more in France.

The letter to the Chevalier is dated Paris, 17th October 1729.

¹ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 353.

² Critical Essay, p. 216.

³ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 365.

⁴ Critical Essay, p. 585.

⁵ Ibid. p. 565.

⁶ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 353.

His ‘Letter on the Ancient Form of holding Synods in Scotland,’ addressed to Dr. Wilkins, and prefixed to the first volume of the *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ*, is dated at Paris the 23d November 1735. Thomas Innes died at the Scots College on the 28th of January 1744, in the eighty-second year of his age.

Such are the scanty memorials which I have been able to collect in regard to the life of this learned man. The service done by him to the historical literature of his country by the publication of the *Critical Essay* is well known; but his labours, and the benefits we owe to them, are by no means to be measured by that work, and those already referred to by name. Next to his religious and professional duties, he devoted himself to researches in Scottish history and antiquities, and the results of his inquiries were always freely available to every one who requested his assistance.

Many proofs remain of the extent and accuracy of his researches, and of his readiness to make them useful to others. Five closely-written volumes, mostly in his own hand, of his manuscript collections in Scottish history still exist, and were in the possession of Mr. Laing, late keeper of the Signet Library, Edinburgh. A thick quarto volume of collections and dissertations was at Preshome, under the charge of the late Right Rev. Bishop Kyle. The papers printed in the second volume of the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club have already been repeatedly referred to. Mention is there made of Innes having ‘been in habits of communication with more than one of the few cultivators of Scottish antiquities in his time.’¹ His ‘Letter to Professor John Ker, of King’s College, Aberdeen,’ is particularly noticed. Besides the ‘Letter on the Ancient Form of holding Synods in Scotland,’ he supplied Dr. Wilkins with the canons of the later Scottish Councils. The assistance which he gave to Bishop Keith in his *History*, and in his *Catalogue of Scottish Bishops*, is less known. In the former work the Bishop, while acknowledging his obligations to the author of the *Critical Essay*, takes the opportunity of mentioning the good service which he and his elder brother had done in arranging the papers of the Scots College.² In

¹ Preface, p. exx.

² History, folio edit. p. 151; Spottiswoode Society edit. vol. i. pp. 323, 324.

reference to the *Catalogue of Scottish Bishops*, which was not published till eleven years after the death of Innes, the editor of the *Chartulary of the Church of Glasgow* was the first, so far as I am aware, to point out how much Keith was indebted to his learned countryman.¹

There is yet another work, not hitherto alluded to, which has been attributed by some to Thomas Innes, the *Life of King James II.*, published from the Stuart mss. by Mr. Stanier Clarke, in 1816. There is little external evidence to assist an inquiry into the correctness of this opinion. But such evidence as there is points to Lewis Innes rather than to his brother as the compiler of these memoirs. It is certain that the original memoirs, written by King James himself, from which the *Life* is compiled, were deposited in the Scots College under the special charge of Lewis Innes.² This would also account for what has been remarked in regard to the internal evidence of the work itself—that the language appears to connect itself with a Scotsman. On this subject more need not be added here. Reference may be made to the remarks upon it in Lord Holland's Preface to Fox's *History of James II.*, in Mr. Clarke's Preface to the *Memoirs*, and in the 'Life of Thomas Innes,' in Chambers's *Biographical Dictionary*.

What has been said, imperfect as it is, will perhaps show the chief features by which the character of Thomas Innes was distinguished. Sufficient evidence of his worth is to be found in the reputation of those with whom he associated, and in the manner in which he is spoken of by all who knew him. His intimacy with some of the most pious divines of the Gallican Church has already been alluded to. But, beyond the bounds of his own communion, he was esteemed by all who were acquainted with him. The accomplished Atterbury, and the learned and modest Ruddiman, appear to have been equally attracted towards him. Even Wodrow—although it is not clear whether he had ever conversed with him—influenced, probably, by the one point of sympathy between them, seems to have had a sort of liking for the 'monkish, bookish person' whom he saw pursuing his antiquarian researches at Edinburgh. He was on terms of intimacy with Bishop Archibald Campbell,

¹ Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, Preface, pp. vii., viii.

² Life of James II., Preface, pp. xx., xxi.

and Bishop Keith speaks of him as ‘his worthy and learned friend.’

Before proceeding to consider more particularly the literary character of Thomas Innes, in connection with his *Critical Essay* and his *Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, a brief account may be given of the other members of his family, and of its subsequent fortunes.

James Innes of Drumgask had six sons—Lewis, Thomas, Charles (his successor in Drumgask), Walter, Francis, and John, and one daughter, Elizabeth.

The eldest son, Lewis, was born at Walkerdales, in the Enzie, in 1651. He studied at Paris, and on the death of Principal Robert Barclay, in February 1682, was appointed Principal of the Scots College there. The institution, which afterwards received the name of the Scots College of Paris, originated in an endowment given by David, Bishop of Murray, in the beginning of the fourteenth century. Archbishop James Beaton of Glasgow was a great benefactor to it, and was looked upon as its second founder. He appointed the convent of the Carthusians in Paris to be the overseers of his foundation,¹ and, as already mentioned, had deposited the records of the Church of Glasgow, along with his own papers, partly in the College, partly in the Chartreuse. Along with his brother Thomas, Lewis Innes devoted himself to the preservation and arrangement of those records. He took a conspicuous part in the proceedings connected with the vindication of the authenticity of the famous charter which established the legitimacy of King Robert the Third. The Principal carried this charter to St. Germain, where it was shown to King James and the nobility and gentry of his court. He afterwards submitted it to an examination by the most famous antiquaries of France, including Renaudot, Baluze, Mabillon, and Ruinart, in the presence of several of the Scottish nobility and gentry, at a solemn assembly held in the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Pres, on the 26th of May 1694.²

¹ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 369.

² See Letter of Thomas Innes to the University of Glasgow, Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 370; Ruddiman's Preface to the *Diplomata Scotiæ*, p. 37; and the attestation of the Charter, pp. 27–30, as printed at Paris in 1695. The date of 12th January, given as that of the Assembly in the letter, is a mistake into which Innes probably fell from that being the date of the charter itself, and his thus confusing the two while writing.

Lewis Innes is said to have been one of five who acted as a Cabinet Council to James II. at St. Germain, on his return from Ireland in 1690.¹ On the 11th November 1701 he was admitted almoner to the queen-mother, Mary of Este, an office which he had previously held while she was queen-consort. On 23d December 1713 he was admitted almoner to her son, the Chevalier de St. George, and, on 17th March 1714, a warrant was issued for appointing him Lord Almoner.² In 1713 he resigned the office of Principal of the Scots College. His resignation was caused by his being constantly occupied with the political affairs of the exiled house. He appears to have acted as a sort of confidential secretary. Repeated allusions to him are to be found scattered through the printed volume of the *Stuart Papers*. In the beginning of 1718 he was set aside from his office. It is not easy to ascertain the exact nature of the transactions which led to this, but the following circumstances may be mentioned: When the Convocation of Canterbury was prorogued by George I., whose ministers were alarmed by the proceedings of the Lower House,—a prorogation which resulted in the Convocations of both provinces not being allowed to meet again for the despatch of business,—the well-known Charles Leslie wrote to the Chevalier that the members of the English Church were disgusted with the tyrannical exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, and that the adherents of James were afraid that, in the event of a restoration, similar dangers might be apprehended. He therefore advised the Chevalier to address a letter, ostensibly to himself, but intended really for the English clergy in general, promising ample security to the Church of England. James acted on this advice, and Lewis Innes having made a translation of the letter into French, was accused of putting a false interpretation on certain parts, which might materially injure his master in England. For this, and some other reasons not exactly known, he was discharged from acting in the Chevalier's employment.³ The precise time during which he remained unemployed does not exactly appear, but within a few years he was again in confidential commun-

¹ Life of James II., vol. ii. p. 411.

² Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. pp. 376, 377; Life of James II., Preface, p. xx.

³ See Stuart Papers, vol. i. pp. 24, 25, 37.

cation with his master. He seems to have been one of those most trusted in the important business of securing Bishop Atterbury's papers, which, on that prelate's decease, were taken possession of and deposited in the Scots College.¹

Lewis Innes appears to have materially assisted in defraying the expenses attending the composition and publication of the *Critical Essay*.² He died at Paris on the 23d of January 1738. In answer to a letter from his brother Thomas, communicating the intelligence of his decease, the Chevalier expressed his concern that he had lost a most faithful servant, who possessed a capacity and zeal for his service not always to be found in the same person.³ Thirty-seven years before, similar testimony had been borne by the Chevalier's father to the zeal, discretion, and affection of Lewis Innes.

Walter, the fourth son of James Innes of Drungask, studied at the Scots College at Rome. He resided for some time in France, and returned to Scotland as a missionary priest in 1688. He was imprisoned in 1690 for exercising his duties as a missionary; but, being liberated in April 1691, went to France in the end of the same year, and from thence to Rome, to assist William Lesley, the mission agent. In May 1700 he again came to Scotland as a missionary. In 1703 or 1704 he publicly officiated in the hall of his brother's house at Drumgask, wherein, it is mentioned, an altar was placed;⁴ and, in 1715, it is known that he continued to be stationed on Deeside, in the neighbourhood of the family property. In June 1722 he left Scotland and went to France. He died on the 15th of August in the same year at his benefice in that country.

Francis, the fifth son, was married to Jean Maitland, and had issue, James, Lewis, Charles, Robert (afterwards a Jesuit priest), and Elizabeth. He was bailie of Aboyne in 1690.⁵

John, the sixth son, was born on the 31st July 1668. He entered the novitiate as a Jesuit at Watten in October 1688, and two years afterwards completed his vows at Vienna. He

¹ See Preface to the *Stuart Papers*, *passim*.

² See Thomas Innes' Letter to 'The King,' Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 356.

³ Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 379; Life of James II., Preface, pp. xx., xxi.

⁴ Blackhall's *Briefe Narration*, Appendix to Preface, p. xxxv.

⁵ List of Pollable Persons within the Shire of Aberdeen, vol. i. p. 66.

studied philosophy at Gratz, and theology at Vienna. He was occasionally known by the name of Robison, assumed probably from that of his mother's family. He officiated occasionally at Glengarden,¹ and was afterwards a missionary in Russia for eleven years. He returned to Scotland in 1718, and served as a missionary in Galloway, where he died 6th May 1757.²

Charles, the third son of James Innes, who succeeded to Drumgask on his father's decease, was born in 1663. He was married to Claudia Irvine, and had three sons, Lewis, James his successor, and George, and four daughters, Jane, Elizabeth, Henrietta, and Claudia.³ In consequence of his brother Lewis' and his own services to the house of Stuart, he had an annual pension of £200 from the Court of St. Germains.⁴ He died on the 21st November 1746, aged eighty-three.

Lewis, eldest son of Charles Innes of Drumgask, predeceased his father, dying on the 26th May 1729.

George, the third son, studied at Paris in the College of Navarre. He came to the Scottish Mission in October 1712, and in 1713 was appointed President of Sealan College, in Glenlivet. In November 1727 he returned to Paris, and became Prefect of Studies in the Scots College. On the 10th of October 1738 he succeeded Principal Whitford as head of the College, and died there on the 29th April 1752.⁵

James, second son of Charles Innes, succeeded his father in Drumgask. He married Catherine, daughter of George Gordon of Glastirum, and niece of Bishop Gordon, V.A., and acquired the estate of Balnacraig. He had four sons, Lewis, his successor, Charles, Alexander, and Henry, and two daughters, Elizabeth and Jane. He died on the 11th February 1786.

Charles, second son of James Innes of Balnacraig and Drumgask, was a merchant in Riga. He purchased the estate of Ballogie, and, dying unmarried, left it to his elder brother Lewis.

¹ Blackhall's *Briefe Narration*, p. xxxi.

² Oliver's *Collections on the Scotch, English, and Irish Members of the Society of Jesus*, p. 24.

³ Blackhall's *Briefe Narration*, p. xxxv.

⁴ Spalding Club *Miscellany*, vol. ii. pp. 376, 377.

⁵ *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, Preface, p. xiii.; and Spalding Club *Miscellany*, vol. ii. p. 379.

Alexander, the third son, was a priest, and a member of the Scots College at Paris. His name appears prominently in the rather obscure accounts which remain relative to the records in the Scots College at the time of the first French Revolution.¹ The College had its full share in the calamities of that dreadful time. George Innes had been succeeded as Principal by John Gordon, and probably on the decease of the latter in 1777 Alexander Gordon became Principal.² In September 1792 the Principal escaped from Paris, after refusing to take the new republican oath, and came to Scotland. The other members of the College also fled, and Alexander Innes alone remained. He was imprisoned, and was only saved in consequence of the death of Robespierre taking place on the day appointed for his execution.³ Alexander Innes appears to have continued at Paris. He was there, at all events, in 1798 and 1802. He had succeeded as Principal of the College, or at least discharged the duties of that office, and died on the 14th of September 1803.⁴

Henry, the fourth son of James Innes, was also a member of the Scots College at Paris, and Procurator and Prefect of Studies. Two letters from Prince Charles Edward to Henry Innes are printed in the second volume of the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club. After leaving France he was for some time chaplain to an English family in Devonshire. He came to Scotland about the year 1800, and officiated as clergyman at Balnaeraig till his death, on the 11th November 1833, in the eighty-seventh year of his age.

Lewis, the eldest son of James Innes, succeeded his father in Balnaeraig, and, as already mentioned, acquired Ballogie from his brother Charles. He was married to a daughter of Provost Young of Aberdeen, and had one son, William, and a daughter,

¹ See on this point Lord Holland's Preface to Fox's History of King James II.; Mr. Stanier Clarke's Preface to the Life of James II.; the Preface to the Chartulary of the Church of Glasgow; and an article on the Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Scotland, Quarterly Review, No. cxliv.

² Compare Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, Preface, pp. iii. and viii.; Analecta Scotica, vol. i. pp. 10-13; and Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. p. 379.

³ Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, Preface, p. viii.; Preface to Fox's History of James II., p. xxii.

⁴ Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, Preface, p. viii.; Preface to Fox's History of James II., pp. xxiii. and xxiv.

Mary. William was educated at the Scots College of Douay, was a priest, and officiated for some time at Drummond Castle, afterwards at Carlogie, on the family property. He died in January 1836. Mary was a nun at Paris, of the order of the Poor Clares. Lewis Innes of Balnacraig and Ballogie died on the 27th day of November 1815, leaving his estates to Lewis Farquharson, a son of the house of Inverey.

The preceding brief record of this family of priests may not be altogether uninteresting. For the greater part of the information on which it is founded, I was indebted to the kindness of the Reverend George A. Griffin, sometime of St. Mary's College, Blairs.

The college with which the Innes family were so intimately connected was never restored to the condition in which it was before the French Revolution. A considerable part of the property was lost altogether; the Roman Catholic bishops in Scotland succeeded in preserving the rest. The institution itself no longer exists; but the manor near Paris, the original endowment of the Bishop of Murray, remained, at least till recently, with the Scottish Mission—a link connecting the present day with the age of Bruce.

Thomas Innes has hitherto been chiefly known by his *Critical Essay*, now reprinted, and on that work his fame will no doubt mainly continue to rest. Its merits have long been universally admitted. It has been well remarked, with particular reference to Pinkerton and Chalmers, that ‘authors who agree in nothing else have united to build on the foundations which Innes laid, and to extol his learning and accuracy, his candour and sagacity.’¹

It is needless to say more on this point; but it is proper to make some remarks regarding the *Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*. The Preface to the *Essay* made its readers aware that that work was only to serve as an introduction to another on the *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*. After mentioning that he had laid aside for some time the first rude draft of the *Essay*, Innes adds: ‘But being afterwards prevailed upon to search into, and to endeavour to give some account of the beginning and progress of the doctrine and discipline of the Christian Church in our northern parts of the island, and it

¹ See Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. ii. Preface, p. cxv., and passages from the Enquiry and Caledonia.

appearing impossible to give any distinct account of the religious history of any country without that the civil state of it and that of its inhabitants were first well understood ; for these reasons, and being otherwise satisfied that nothing solid or lasting could be built upon the schemes of our civil history and antiquities such as our own modern writers, especially Boece and Buchanan, had left, I found myself obliged to resume the rude draft I had formerly made of this *Essay*, as the only sure foundation on which I could venture any distinct or lasting account of the religious part of our history. Wherefore, having made a new examination of all contained in it, after retrenching what seemed superfluous, and adding new observations, I reduced the whole into the method and order in which it now appears. And being thus reduced into a continued series and distinct order, I could not refuse to show it to some few honourable persons versed in the history of our own and of other countries, and on whose judgment I might depend and confide in. I found them, after they had read and considered it, of opinion that the facts asserted in it were supported with such proofs, and the whole written with such regard to the true honour of our country, that it could not fail to be acceptable to the learned among our countrymen who loved truth and the real honour of Scotland, and therefore they insisted that it ought to be published by itself without waiting for the ecclesiastical part, which was scarce begun, and which might be obstructed by the advanced age of the author, and twenty other accidents, from ever being continued on or perfected.¹

With these passages may be compared what he himself had communicated to Ruddiman on the subject of this work, as already quoted in the extract from Wodrow's *Analecta*.

For many years it was not known in Scotland what had become of this *Ecclesiastical History*, or second part of the *Critical Essay*. Pinkerton, while remarking that ‘it may be easily seen to what side he would incline,’ adds, ‘there is great room to regret that he did not publish this second part.’² George Chalmers was more fortunate in this respect than his anti-

¹ *Critical Essay*, Preface, pp. vii. and viii. See also Preface, p. xxi., and *Essay*, pp. 1, 728, 760, and *passim*.

² *Enquiry*, edit. 1814, Introduction, p. lxiv.

quarian rival. He had the *History* in his possession, and freely availed himself of it. The references to it in the *Caledonia* naturally led to the wish that the whole work might be published ; and this was accomplished by the Spalding Club.

The *History* is written in the same simple and perspicuous style which distinguishes the *Critical Essay*, its greatest defect being the occurrence of frequent Gallicisms, a circumstance which the personal history of the author sufficiently explains.

The narrative is founded on a careful examination of the best existing authorities. No such examination had been made by previous writers on the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. These writers were generally ignorant of the real sources of authentic history, and made no proper use of what they did know. Innes, at once admitting that his materials were scanty, and that he was frequently obliged to use doubtful authorities to some extent, made the most careful inquiries as to the best sources of information, and, when he found them, made the best use of them. Where he was obliged to rely on doubtful guides or probable conjecture, he warns his readers that such is the case. The earlier part of his work is derived from the authentic accounts of the Latin and Greek historians of the Empire. As he advances, and before he enters on the full current of the history of Venerable Bede, the narrative is derived from a great variety of sources, —chiefly from the ancient lives of the saints. In using these last he avails himself of the critical aids in the way of a just appreciation of their authority, which he found in the works of the great school of ecclesiastical history in France, with some of whose brightest ornaments he was personally familiar. From the time of St. Columba till nearly the close of his narrative, he possesses the invaluable guidance of Bede.

Something may now be said as to the spirit in which Innes' work is written. So far as the proper narrative is concerned, it will be difficult to find a fault. In his reasonings and disquisitions—of which, perhaps, there is more than enough—the Roman ecclesiastic is easily discerned ; but he does not seek to keep this character in the background. While he writes as an avowed adherent of the Roman see, his usual moderation never forsakes him. He has no favour for the temporal authority of the Pope over Christian kingdoms, or even for his unlimited power in spiritual matters. He is much more zealous for the doctrines

and discipline of the Church than for the prerogatives of the see of Rome.

The following opinion is given as to the design of the *History*, by a writer qualified beyond most others to speak with authority on the subject:—‘ As in his *Essay* he had laboured to establish the high monarchical principle, it was his object in the *Ecclesiastical History* to support chiefly two doctrines,—the consecutive ordination of bishops, from the apostolic times to his own day, in the Church of Scotland, and the necessity of the episcopal order in all churches; and, secondly, that Christianity came to Scotland through Rome.’¹ There can be little doubt that one main inducement to write the work was to vindicate the Church to which he belonged from the attacks of those who supported what he calls the new Reformation. No one has any right to quarrel with him for so doing. He simply discharged what to him was a plain duty. If it can be made out that he sacrificed historical truth for this or any other purpose, he will deserve the severest censure.

This appears to be the proper place for noticing the most serious imputation to which the moral and literary character of Innes is liable.

In his letter² to the Chevalier, Innes makes some remarks on the nature and design of the *Critical Essay*. Referring to the book itself for his general motives in writing it, so far as he had thought it proper to render them public, he explains that he had also another motive, which he could not divulge with safety. This was to expose the seditious principles founded on the fabulous history of the forty kings, to which the writings of Buchanan had given such influence, and which had such effect during the civil wars of Queen Mary’s reign, and those in the time of Charles the First, and had been used to justify the proceedings of the Scottish Convention in deposing their sovereign in 1689. He states that to carry out his object in exposing those opinions, he had been obliged ‘to bring it in as a necessary part of his subject, under the pretence of inquiring into the true era of the Scottish monarchy.’

It may well be doubted how far any one is entitled to keep his real motives in the background to the extent here implied.

¹ *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, Preface, p. vii.

² *Spalding Club Miscellany*, vol. ii. pp. 353–356.

But though it may appear absurd to question the author's evidence against himself, yet I cannot help thinking that in this letter Innes attributes much more weight to the political reasons for writing his *Essay* than they really had. An impartial examination of the *Essay* itself and of his other writings will show that the ostensible object of the work must have been to a great extent the real one, and that his letter to James must admit of some of the qualifications which are frequently allowed in similar cases. At all events, the letter shows that no conscious misstatement was made to support his opinions. He not only believed all that he wrote, but, further, mentioned little except what could be verified by the best evidence. I cannot conclude these remarks better than in the language of the writer already quoted: ¹—‘ It is now well known that Father Innes’ chief object in that work was, as he describes it himself, to counteract the inventions of former historians, and “to go to the bottom of the dark contrivances of factious men against the sovereignty of our kings.” But in spite of the strong party feeling which was paramount in his mind, he was of so temperate a nature and so honest withal, that no quotations or statements of fact, scarcely an argument or conclusion in his work, has ever been challenged.’

Could we suppose that Innes had been actuated by dishonest motives in writing his *Essay*, the temptation to sacrifice truth to his own political or ecclesiastical opinions would certainly have been yet stronger in the *History*.

In estimating what Innes has accomplished, we must keep in mind that he was not permitted to advance far beyond the very threshold of his plan. What he has left is only a fragment of the work which he projected. It may be allowable to express a feeling of regret that he did not live to complete it. He stops towards the commencement of the ninth century. Other three centuries and a half of darkness and barbarism, and he would have reached the great reformation of the Scottish Church by King David. He would then have had the guidance of the chartularies which he had studied so carefully, and which he was among the first to understand and appreciate, and he would have given us a true and authentic account of the ecclesiastical system that prevailed during five centuries, whose

¹ Preface to the *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis*, p. vii.

history still remains almost entirely unknown to the great majority of his countrymen.

The ‘Letter on the Ancient Manner of holding Synods in Scotland,’ printed in the first volume of Wilkins’ *Concilium, the Critical Essay, the Civil and Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, A.D. 80 to 818*, and the papers in the *Miscellany* of the Spalding Club, form a collection of the most valuable of Innes’ writings.

ON THE ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF SCOTLAND.

ON THE ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF SCOTLAND.

THE PREFACE.

1. **T**H E humour of running up the originals of nations to incredible heights prevailed almost among all those of whom we have any certain account, each nation vying with and endeavouring to surpass one another in their antiquities. Thus we observe the contentions that were in ancient times betwixt the Egyptians, the Scythians, and other nations of the East concerning the antiquity of their first settlements, and to what an absurd multitude of years and number of ancient kings they pretended.

The most part of other nations were in proportion possessed with the same humour; and the more they were ignorant of what passed before their own time, the more they were inclined to run up their antiquities to incredible heights, nay, some even before the creation of the world.

It is then no wonder that the inhabitants of Great Britain and Ireland were like to other nations in this. The time of the first planting of these islands being in those ages when they had no use of letters, and by consequence no means of preserving the memory of past transactions, and less yet of calculation of dates or epochs, left them a fair field of expatiating in the dark ages of the most remote antiquity, under the conduct of their ignorant and venal guides, the bards, famous for their flattering their patrons with ancient pedigrees, and whole nations with ancient successions of kings.

2. In the course of ages, in proportion as the world came to be polished with letters, arts, and sciences, and with the knowledge of the rules of chronology, all those high fabrics of antiquity which the vanity or ignorance of former times had reared up were the more easily overturned that they had no solid foundation nor support; particularly within these two last ages, when, by the discovery of so many monuments of antiquity which in former ages had lain forgotten, and, as it were, buried in the corners of old libraries, the true taste of solid antiquity

hath been revived, and the study of genuine historical monuments and of the rules of chronology improved, we observe that the more learned almost in all countries have, without any offence of the generality of their countrymen, and with the approbation of the best judges among them, made no difficulty to inquire into the grounds of their more remote antiquities ; and however they may have been in vogue in former ages, they have taken the liberty to reduce both the antiquity of their settlement and number of their kings to the true standard of the best vouchers that they could find.

3. The debates about the antiquity of the settlement and monarchy of the Scots, as they are accounted for in our modern writers, and the several pieces published within the last age for and against them by learned writers of our own country on the one side, and on the other by those of England and Ireland, gave me the first thoughts of inquiring into the bottom of this controversy, in order to find out the truth, or, at least, what was most conformable to it ; and after reading with all the attention I could, and with all the impartiality that it is possible to have in what one's country is concerned in, what had been written on both sides, and after examining with no less application all that I could meet with in ancient writers or monuments, printed or MS., relating to the subject, the result of all was the first rude draught of this essay.

Thus the substance of it was drawn up several years ago ; and though I was then no less convinced than I am at present of the truth of it, especially as to the story of the first forty kings before Fergus, son of Erch, as accounted for by Hector Boece, yet an apprehension to be thought singular or presumptuous, and an aversion to be the first that should not only depart from, but contradict, the common opinion of my countrymen in a matter which had been esteemed honourable to our country,—these considerations, I acknowledge, made me at first resolve to suppress, at least during my own time, this essay, and leave to others the invidious task of reforming our vulgar historians.

4. But being afterwards prevailed upon to search into and to endeavour to give some account of the beginning and progress of the doctrine and discipline of the Christian church in our northern parts of the island, and it appearing impossible to give any distinct account of the religious history of any country without that the civil state of it, and that of its inhabitants, were first well understood,—for these reasons, and being otherwise satisfied that nothing solid or lasting could be built upon the schemes of our civil history and antiquities, such as our modern writers, especially Boece and Buchanan, had left, I

found myself obliged to resume the rude draught I had formerly made of this essay, as the only sure foundation on which I could venture any distinct or lasting account of the religious part of our history.

Wherefore, having made a new examination of all contained in it, after retrenching what seemed superfluous and adding new observations, I reduced the whole into the method and order in which it now appears. And being thus reduced into a continued series and distinct order, I could not refuse to show it to some few honourable persons versed in the history of our own and of other countries, and on whose judgment I might depend and confide in. I found them, after they had read and considered it, of opinion that the facts asserted in it were supported with such proofs, and the whole written with such a regard to the true honour of our country, that it could not fail to be acceptable to the learned among our countrymen, who loved truth and the real honour of Scotland; and therefore they insisted that it ought to be published by itself, without waiting for the ecclesiastical part, which was scarce begun, and which might be obstructed by the advanced age of the author, and twenty other accidents, from ever being continued on or perfected.

5. From these and such other reasons I was at last persuaded to let it appear rather from my own hand than from that of any other, being unwilling to have the many faults or mistakes of my own, that I doubt not will be found in it, augmented by those which an editor not so well accustomed to the style or matter, besides errors and mistakes in the copy, might add to it. I consented, then, to let it be published, but on condition that I should first communicate it, and have the opinion of two or three persons in our own country of distinguished merit and knowledge of its history and antiquities, and that at the same time I might make a new search in the country for ancient historical monuments, for or against the system that I had established, which might give further light to the whole subject. And it was only after having communicated it to those persons in the country whom I looked upon as good judges of such a work, and having found them of the same opinion as those I had at first advised with, and after having met with, in my searches of ancient monuments, new proofs of what I had established in the essay, and nothing of moment opposite to it, —it was, I say, after this that I resolved at last to venture to expose it to the impartial judgment of the public.

6. In compiling it I proposed to myself no complete work, but to keep within bounds of the title it bears of an essay; but an essay upon the most ancient and the most obscure part of

our history, such as might be so much the more useful an help to any that would undertake it, that by a certain course of inquiry, and in order to give more light to the subject, I have been obliged to follow a method very different from that of those who have hitherto treated it, and to beat out to myself, if I may say so, paths that had not been trodden before; having thought it more secure to direct my course by such glimpses of light as the more certain monuments of antiquity furnished me, than to follow, as so many others have done, with so little advantage to the credit of our antiquities, the beaten road of our modern writers.

If in this new path, where I had none to go before me, I have sometimes mistaken my way, it will be no surprise to me, and I shall be always ready to accept with gratitude the help of any friendly hand that can set me right. All I can answer for is my sincere endeavours to search impartially after truth, and a fixed resolution to prefer, upon all occasions, what I conceived most conformable to it, before all prejudices whatsoever.

7. But as my resolution to prefer truth to all prejudices did not exempt me from the duty and regard I owed to my country, I looked upon it as a part of that duty to endeavour, as far as I was able, to remove those prejudices; and in order to that, to examine into the sources whence the new schemes of our history, drawn up by our modern writers, had taken their rise, and to endeavour, if possible, to place the ancient state of our country on a better footing, by substituting to these new schemes such accounts of our antiquities as are no less honourable to the country, and at the same time are more certain and more conformable to the best ancient writers.

I observed that the chief occasion and source of all the mistakes and errors of these later writers, which had chiefly laid them open to the censures of the learned in other countries, was that, excepting the Picts alone, whom they could not but acknowledge a distinct race of people from the Scots that came in from Ireland, these writers supposed in general that all the other ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain made a part of these Scots. So with them the Brigantes, the Meatae, the Caledonii, the Horresti, etc., were all Scots; and in consequence, whatever they found in ancient writers performed by these ancient people, of whatever name, who dwelt within the bounds of what composed since the kingdom of Scotland, was by them attributed to these Scots.

8. What chiefly contributed to lead our writers into these mistakes was an opinion that had generally gained credit among the Scots before their time, that the Scots had been

settled in Britain long before the incarnation, and had been in possession of all the northern parts of it excepting what was occupied by the Picts, whose kingdom was, by these writers, reduced into much narrower bounds than it had in reality.

From this it was natural for them to look upon all the other inhabitants of these northern countries as being a part of the Scots, under the various names that they bore ; and, by consequence, to attribute to the Scots all that they found honourably related of them in ancient writers.

It was upon the same foundation that the fabric of the remote antiquities of the Scots, and particularly that of the monarchy, and of the first forty or forty-five kings in the Scotish line, was first traced by John Fordun ; and, being left very imperfect by him, was filled up and brought into a continued history by Boece, upon the memoirs furnished him under the names of Veremund, Campbell, etc., and the whole revised and put into a more taking dress fitted to his purpose, and in a noble style of Latin, by Buchanan ; the times, conjunctures of affairs, and dispositions of our people, in which these three writers compiled their histories, serving to make them meet with a more favourable and a more general reception by our countrymen, as it will appear of each in its proper place.

By those means the accounts given by these writers of the ancient settlement and monarchy of the Scots in Britain had gained such credit among our countrymen, as contributing to the honour and reputation of the country, and have to that degree overawed those of them who had examined more impartially these remote antiquities, that though some of our later writers have not made difficulty to insinuate, as occasion offered, their doubts and difficulties about them, none of our writers hitherto have ventured to publish anything like a critique of them.

9. And yet what serves all this fondness for these remote antiquities, if they be destitute of solid grounds and proper vouchers to support them, but to make us pass in the judgment of the learned of other countries for a credulous people, far from doing any real honour to our country ?

Our pretensions to excel other nations in the antiquity of the settlement and monarchy of the Scots in Britain, have long ago stirred up the emulation of the learned in other countries, especially in those of our neighbourhood, to inquire into the grounds of them, and to expose the uncertain, or even fabulous, foundations on which most of them are built. And we live in an age in which all ancient accounts of history, however confidently delivered in the finest dress by modern writers, are

brought back to a trial, and, whatever vogue they may have had for an age or two, are allowed by the best judges of these kind of performances no more credit than what is due to their vouchers.

Besides the little ground there is of the story of the first forty kings before Fergus, son of Erch, there are other reasons, which will appear in their proper place, that prove that the account of the succession, lives, actions, and exits of these kings, as they are set down by Boece and Buchanan (for John Fordun could find nothing of these details), far from doing any real honour to our country, or contributing, as all historical accounts ought to do, to the benefit of posterity and to the mutual happiness of king and people, do rather bring a reproach upon the country, and furnish a handle to turbulent spirits to disturb the quiet and peace, and, by consequence, the happiness of the inhabitants.

How far this is the case of the story of the first forty kings, particularly as it is delivered by Boece and Buchanan, will appear in the second book of this essay. At least the matter is of that concern, that no man that loves the honour and happiness of his country will, I hope, be dissatisfied to have it brought to a trial.

10. Our part of the island having been in ancient times inhabited by five distinct people,—the Britains, the Caledonians or Picts, the Romans, the Scots, and the Saxons,—my intention in the first book was, after a short account of the Romans in the island, to treat a part of the two most ancient inhabitants of our northern parts, the Britains, called Meats, and the Caledonians, and to show that, as, on the one hand, there is no ground in ancient writers to believe they were of the race of the Scots, or made a part of them, as our modern historians pretend; so, on the other, the remains of these two ancient people, the first known inhabitants of what composes the kingdom of Scotland, having been at last by degrees incorporated with the rest of its inhabitants into one body of people with the Scots, and their possessions into one kingdom of Scotland, the present inhabitants throughout all the provinces where that ancient people formerly dwelt may claim by as just a title for their countrymen, those of that ancient people who were famous in former ages either for the sanctity of their lives or for their martial valour, as if these great men had been descended of the Scots. They may also reckon down from them the antiquity of their first settlement, and from the first of their kings, I mean of the Caledonians or Picts, the antiquity of the monarchy, as well as from that of the Scots.¹

¹ *Vid. pp. 35 and 105, infra.*

Hence follows that the present inhabitants of Scotland, independently of the new schemes of the antiquity of the settlement and monarchy of the Scots drawn up by our modern writers, may lay claim to as ancient a settlement and monarchy as any people of the islands of Britain or Ireland; and, by consequence, may be very indifferent about the time of the first settlement in Britain of these Scots that came from Ireland, and about the antiquity of the monarchy in the Scotish line.¹

And it ought also to be observed, that as to the antiquity of the monarchy even in this Scotish line, as I have accounted for it from the surest and most ancient historical monuments that I could meet with, and beginning this monarchy only at King Fergus, son of Erch, from this king till King James VI., the last of our kings that resided in Scotland, and the first of Great Britain, we have sixty-three kings hereditarily succeeding one to another, in a lineal descent of thirty-seven degrees, during the space of eleven hundred years, which is a greater antiquity than any hereditary monarchy of Europe of one uninterrupted race can pretend to.

11. What concerns the Meats and Caledonians or Picts is treated at length in the first book of this essay; and as, on the one hand, it was necessary to give an account of each of these ancient inhabitants of our northern parts, so, I hope, it will on the other equally serve to prepare the judicious and impartial readers among our countrymen to enter with more indifference and impartiality into the examination of the historical schemes of our modern writers, contained chiefly in the second book.

And therefore my first intention was to have given what is contained in this essay separately in three distinct dissertations, one after another, which might each prepare the reader to the following. And thus to have given in the first dissertation all that is contained here in the first book; in the second, all that is contained under the title of the first section of the second book; and in the third dissertation, what is contained in the second section of the second book, but which ought to have been entitled the third book. However, I was afterwards advised to give the whole essay at once, which, being read in the order it is here placed, may have the same effect, each part serving for a preparation and introduction to the following one.

And this was one of the motives of my following this order in treating of the ancient inhabitants. Another more natural motive was, to conform myself to the order of the time of their first settlement in the island, or of the first mention that is made of them in ancient writers. First, the Britains; the

¹ *Vid. pp. 109, 110, etc., infra.*

Caledonians or Picts in the second place; in the third, the Romans; the Scots in the fourth; and last of all, the Saxons.

I have begun with the Romans, that being necessary to give light to the rest. But the transactions of the Romans in this island in general having been already treated by so many writers after Camden,—their walls being described with great exactitude by the late learned Dr. Smith in his edition of Bede's history,—and all the remains of the Romans in our northern parts of the island having been of late carefully surveyed and accurately described and illustrated with copper-plates by our countryman, Mr. Gordon, in his *Itinerarium Septentrionale*, I found it would be useless to add or to alter anything in the short account I had drawn up some years ago of the Romans; especially finding that the account I had given of the situation of the Roman walls, which was the chief thing I had use for, was in the main conformable to that of these learned gentlemen.

12. A third reason that determined me to this order was, that the view I had in this essay being to endeavour to make a solid foundation for what may be gleaned from ancient writers, or for what remains there are, after all the disasters befallen ecclesiastical monuments in Scotland, in order to give some account of the first entry and of the progress of the doctrine and discipline of Christianity in our northern parts of this island, nothing seemed more natural in this view than the order I have followed in treating of these several ancient inhabitants, among whom it appears, by the situation of the affairs of that part of the island, or rather by a particular disposition of Divine Providence, that the spreading of the light of the gospel followed the order of the first settlement of the inhabitants.

The Sun of Righteousness began very early to shine from abroad in the Roman part of the island, and from thence the beams of that heavenly light were derived by degrees northward to the Midland Britains or Meats, in the intervals that they were subjected to the empire or included in it; as they were from the building of Antoninus' wall, A.D. 138, betwixt the friths, which, opening a free commerce with the southmost parts of the island, gave a favourable occasion of the gospel's penetrating to the more northern. Hence we may observe by the famous passage of Tertullian,¹ written about A.D. 209, that there were already believers in Christ even in those parts of the island which the Romans had not subdued. The violent persecution of Dioclesian in the end of the third, but chiefly in the first years of the fourth century, obliging many Christians

¹ 'Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero sublita.'—*Tertullian, contra Judeos*, c. 7.

to fly for refuge to deserts and uninhabited places, to be out of the reach of the persecutors, could not fail of increasing the number of Christians in the northern parts of the island, without the bounds of the empire.

After the middle of this fourth age, A.D. 369, the territories of the Meats or Midland Britains betwixt the walls were erected into a Roman province by the General Theodosius, under the name of Valentia; and as this opened a more free communication with the provinces of the empire in Britain, so it appears that before the end of the fourth age the Christian religion was spread from one end of this new province to the other. St. Ninian was born of Christian parents, in what was afterwards called Galloway, in the one extremity of it, and in the other, near Dumbarton, St. Patrick was also born of Christian parents, and in a place peopled by Christians; and these two bishops became by themselves and by their disciples the first apostles of the Picts and Scots, both in Ireland and Britain.

Besides what conversions St. Palladius might have made among the Picts and Scots on his retreat from Ireland to the northern parts of Britain, Fergus, son of Erch, first king of the Scots, brought over with him a new addition to the number of Christians; and we have a proof of the zeal for religion of these first kings of Scots, by the reception King Conal, great-grandson to Fergus, made to St. Columba upon his arrival into Albany to convert the northern Picts.

The last people, to wit, the Saxons of the north (some of whom had a settlement in our northern parts), were also converted, the last of all by the Bishop Aydan, his successors and disciples, all of them sent in from Scotland in the seventh age. And thus we see these four ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain were converted to Christianity in the same order that they settled at first in these parts.

13. I had thoughts of making in this preface a review, or remarks upon several places of this essay. But not to retard the printer, who waits for what remains of it, I shall content myself at present to make here the following observations. One is upon what is said page 156, where I express some doubt whether our kings in ancient times had any oath administered to them at their coronation. What gave occasion to my doubting of it was, that I had not observed any account of it anywhere; and particularly, that in the exact edition that Mr. Hearne hath given us of Fordun's history and of its continuation, in which last the solemnity of the coronation of King Alexander III. is described at length, there is no mention in it of any oath administered to him. But since that part of the essay was printed, I have found the ceremony of that coronation

set down at more length by one of Fordun's continuators in the large *Scotichronicon* or Book of Pasly, in the King's library at London; and among other additions to Fordun's continuation I found these words:¹ ‘David episcopo St. Andreæ ipsum regem coram magnatibus terra baltheo militari precingente, & jura, & vota que ad regem spectant prius Latinè postea Gallice² exponente, rex omnia benigne concedens & attemptans,³ a dicto episcopo benedictionem & coronationem lubens subiit & admisit.’ And I suppose the same account will be found in the other large *Scotichronicons*.

14. Another remark is upon what is said, page 302, of the destruction of our historical monuments by King Edward I. of England, to which I also join the carrying off our records. Upon which, an English gentleman of distinction, and of great knowledge in history and antiquities, made me observe that in mentioning King Edward's carrying off our records during the debate of the competitors, I ought also in justice to have mentioned his ordering these records to be restored to John Baliol upon his being declared king.

I ought, indeed, in the first place, I acknowledge, to have distinguished more clearly betwixt the loss we sustained in King Edward I.'s time of ancient histories, or historical monuments, and his carrying off our records. As to historical monuments, besides the general complaint that our writers make against King Edward's carrying off or destroying them, I gave a more ancient and more particular account of the damage that our history suffered from him, taken from the preface of the chronicle of Couper,⁴ which had not as yet been published. And after all, I supposed, and I do so still, that if our ancient churches and convents, with their libraries, had escaped the zeal of the Reformation, there would have still been found good remains of our ancient history, though much neglected, from the time that Fordun's was published, as being very different from his new scheme.

15. As to our public records, I ought indeed to have been more clear in what happened to them in King Edward's reign, and to have distinguished more precisely the times. First, when that king came, A.D. 1291, as an amicable arbitrator of the debates among the competitors, and in that quality the public records were, I suppose, deposited in his hands, or in those of commissioners appointed by him, to be restored to

¹ *Scotichron. Paslat. lib. 10, c. 1.*

² Whether by the word Gallice is meant Gaelic or French, I am in doubt; but it would appear that the king, being then very young, understood only his native language.

³ F. ‘acceptans.’

⁴ *Infra*, p. 125.

whomsoever among the competitors should be declared king. I do also suppose that, as it is contained in a writ published by M. Rymer, they were effectually delivered to King John; though I must acknowledge that I have some doubt whether King Edward, having, during the confusions of a divided and headless nation, gotten himself declared superior lord of Scotland, would be so very scrupulous as to restore back those very special records by which that superiority had been renounced by his predecessors, and Scotland acknowledged as an independent kingdom, such as the charter of release granted by King Richard I. to King William, since it still remains in England, and was very candidly published by M. Rymer from the original. However, I would be sorry to affirm as certain that King Edward kept up any of our records the first time they were in his hands.

But they fell back again a second time into his hands in a very different manner; for, A.D. 1295, King John, wearied with King Edward's provocations, with the reproaches of his subjects, and probably of his own conscience, having renewed the league with Philip, king of France, and having the following year renounced his homage to King Edward, this king came down a second time in a hostile manner against the Scots, who being still divided among themselves (Robert the Bruce, with his party, refusing to acknowledge King John), King Edward became in a short time master of all the strong places of the kingdom, and of King John himself, whom he sent prisoner to England; and then it was that, intending to ruin entirely the monarchy, and abolish the regal dignity among the Scots, the better to secure his title of superior lord over them, he carried off not only the public records, but the regalia, and even the famous stone chair on which our kings used to be crowned.¹ And of any restoration made of what was carried off at this time we have no account, for what was sent back to Scotland at the restoration of King Charles II. was, I suppose, what Cromwell carried off, and even much of that perished in coming back; and I cannot hinder myself from adding, that it were to be wished, for the honour of the kingdom and for the interest of its noble families, that greater care had been, or at least were in times coming, taken by the public, as it is done here in England, for the preservation of the few remains we have still left of ancient records.

16. But to return to King Edward's reign, which, if it had lasted much longer, it appears too well by his behaviour in his last moments, that he intended to make the same ravage in Scotland that he had made in Wales. The brave King Robert

¹ *Vid.* Matth. Westmonaster, and Walsingham.

the Bruce retrieved the sinking state of the kingdom; and having, A.D. 1314, quite routed King Edward II. with his numerous army, in the famous battle at Bannockburn, he continued several years after to harass England, notwithstanding the interposition of the pope and his legates, till he at last forced King Edward III., in a Parliament at York, A.D. 1328, to renounce solemnly, by a writ under his great seal, with consent of Parliament, all title, right, and pretension to any superiority over the kingdom of Scotland; and to declare null and of no force all past acts, writs, and conventions to the contrary, as the same is contained more at large in the original duplicate of the writs or charters of that renunciation, which the Three Estates of Scotland, in Parliament assembled at Perth in March 1415, caused, for greater precaution, and lest the originals might be lost, to be transcribed in a public and authentic form of instrument, and duplicates of it to be deposited in the archives of the chief churches. Of all which there remains only the original duplicate, which was deposited in the archives of the metropolitan church of Glasgo, which was saved, with other ancient records of that church, by the Archbishop James Beaton, from perishing in the general conflagration¹ of all the records or archives of all cathedral churches over the kingdom. And this instrument or duplicate, containing an authentic monument of the liberty and independency of the crown and kingdom of Scotland, and being the only full copy that I know of that now remains, I shall give it in the Appendix, No. VIII., copied verbatim from the original instrument,—the copy of King Edward's renunciation given by M. Anderson, though the best that he could find in Scotland, besides other alterations, cutting off with an etc. at the end both the date and one of the principal clauses of King Edward's charter of renunciation, to wit, the words, ‘Per ipsum regem & consilium in parliamento.’

17. It was among the remains of the records of the same church of Glasgo, which are still carefully preserved, that the ‘*Charta authentica Roberti Seneschalli Scotiæ*’ was found, and being examined, A.D. 1694, in a solemn assembly of the best antiquaries of France, was published the year following, with notes to vindicate the legitimacy of King Robert III.; which small piece having awaked the attention of the learned, hath been since followed by many other larger dissertations, with ample collections of writs and charters to the same purport.

From this we may observe, that in the archives of our cathedral churches and of our great abbeys were deposited not only the records, charters, bulls, and writs of the churches, the collections of canons, the particular histories of these

¹ *Vid. pp. 311, 312, infra.*

churches, with the succession of prelates, and the registers, containing authentic accounts of all ecclesiastical transactions, and such other ancient monuments which, according to the zeal of the Reformers, were condemned to the fire as remains of popery ; but there were also deposited in the same archives, as in sacred azyles (which in former times were held inviolable), many other ancient records, charters, and writs, containing the proofs of the rights and independency of the kingdom, and many original writs proper to illustrate and give light into its history,—many of which, without distinction, perished generally with the rest.

18. Among other matters treated of in this essay,¹ it was not possible to examine Buchanan's history without speaking of Queen Mary, whose cause gave rise to Buchanan's libel, *De Jure Regni*, whereof his history is chiefly designed, as will appear in its proper place, to serve for a proof.

Without this necessary connection that the cause of this princess hath with Buchanan's historical writings and principles, I certainly had not in a work concerning the antiquities of our country touched upon a subject so modern, and so embroiled by the contradictory accounts of so many writers, friends and enemies, according to their different affections and interests. But being obliged to say something of it, and that too in a very great hurry to keep pace with the press, I thought I could not do better than to take my accounts of it from the relation given of it by a man of the probity, integrity, and reputation of Camden, and so well informed of all that concerned it.

I am not afraid that impartial men will find fault with my relying upon Queen Elizabeth's historian for an account of Queen Mary's cause. He had seen all the papers, letters, acts, and relations in the Cotton Library and in the Paper Office that concerned Queen Mary, and more than perhaps now remain. But he had candour and equity that preserved him from being biassed, and judgment to discern what might be relied upon among the great number of pieces that concerned Queen Mary's cause ; he conversed with the persons that were at the helm and at the bottom of affairs when her cause was in agitation, and with many that were eye and ear-witnesses of what concerned her both in England and in Scotland, and saw into the bottom of the intrigues and contrivances of these times against that princess.

And as, on the one hand, he knew that the whole drift of some of the principal counsellors about Queen Elizabeth was to find accusations to blacken Queen Mary, and, by endeavouring to blast her reputation and render her infamous

¹ *Infra*, p. 181, etc.

and odious, to lessen or take away the influence and credit she had even with great numbers in England, as well as abroad ; so, on the other hand, Camden knew what judgment to make of the accusations brought against Queen Mary from Scotland, particularly of the depositions of criminals, who, upon the rack, put in hopes to save their lives by so doing, or at least to obtain a cessation of the torture, said all that was suggested to them, and retracted all again upon the scaffold, when they were ready to appear before a higher tribunal ; and he was too wise to value the acts drawn up against the queen by officers of justice depending on Murray, Morton, etc., directed by their influence, and all of them declared enemies to the queen, and who, after the length they were gone, risked both their lives and fortunes if they did not make her guilty.

All this being of Camden's knowledge, was it necessary that, in order to be thought an impartial writer, he should suppress what he found made for Queen Mary's justification, and publish anew Buchanan's infamous libel against her, and all he could scrape together of the productions of her enemies to support it, that by those means he might have the pleasure to rake into the ashes of the mother of his sovereign, and to disturb in her grave as much as he was able the rest of a princess who could find none during her life ?

When the impression of this preface was thus far advanced, there came to my hands two printed letters from Mr. Buckley to Dr. Mead, the last of which contains some things concerning Camden's annals of Queen Elizabeth which I had not heard of till now, otherwise in the account of Queen Mary's cause, which the connection it hath with Buchanan's history obliged me to treat of in the essay, I could have added to the authority of Camden's annals new proofs, if I had been at more leisure. However, as to his second letter to Dr. Mead, I observe, indeed, by Camden's letter of August 10, 1612, that he was ordered to put the first part of his annals in Sir Robert Cotton's hands, to be communicated to King James ; but it does not appear either by that letter or by any other of Camden's to Thuanus, that any material alterations were made in them. And is it likely that Camden in his private letters to Thuanus, in which he speaks with great freedom and concern of King James' giving suddenly a warrant for printing his annals, would not have also complained to his friend Thuanus that alterations had been made in them had there any such been actually made ? Or that he would not have put Thuanus on his guard, they being sent him to serve for vouchers of his history as to British affairs ? Besides this, it appears by another private letter of Camden to Thuanus (16th April 1605), seven

years before King James saw that first part of his annals, that Camden's genuine sentiments concerning Murray's character, and Buchanan's libels against Queen Mary, were at that time much the same as we find them in his annals.

That King James highly resented that a magistrate of the reputation of Thuanus had let himself be misled by the impudence with which Buchanan had published, in a polite style, the most false and malicious calumnies against the queen, his mother, was very natural. No man alive was better informed than this king himself of the truth of what passed in these times, nor of the crying injustice and inhumanity exercised by the conspirators against the queen, his mother; and what, no doubt, irritated him chiefly against Murray was, that this usurper and his faction made use in their pretended Parliament, in December 1567, of King James' name (at that time a child not eighteen months old) to condemn and depose the queen, his mother, their sovereign, and that without allowing her the liberty to defend herself, either in person or by proxy, as she most earnestly entreated.

This being, and the king, her son, perfectly convinced of the queen's innocence, and of the ambitious designs, calumnies, and malice of her accusers, if he employed men of such known worth and integrity as Sir Robert Cotton, Camden, and Casaubon to engage Thuanus to rectify what he had written of Queen Mary upon false information, it was a duty and justice that the king owed to her Majesty's memory. And when one considers that, on the one hand, the most cunning heads, the bitterest tongues, the most popular declaimers, and the most refined pens in Scotland were by their different interests and animosities combined, especially whilst the distressed queen was close prisoner, to contrive accusations against her and to render them plausible; and that, on the other, all these productions of these conspirators were greedily received and improved to the utmost length by some of the best heads, and who had at that time the greatest credit in the council of England, is it any surprise that writers about those times, such as Thuanus, should have been imposed upon? to say nothing here of his prejudices against the house of Lorraine, of which Queen Mary was descended. But this is enough, and much more than I first intended, upon a subject so embroiled, and upon which there is extant so great abundance of contradictory accounts, both printed and unprinted, that it is likely her cause will continue as yet some ages to furnish matter of writing, for and against, according to the different interests and affections of men.

19. One of the subjects examined in this essay, which, next

to the discussion of the remote antiquities of my own country, made me at first resolve not to let it appear in my own time, was the examination contained in it of the remote antiquities of Ireland. What led me naturally into that discussion was, that one of the chief views that I had in the essay being to examine, as much as it was possible in so dark ages, into the epoch of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain, and they being, by the consent of all the learned, unquestionably come in at first from Ireland, it appeared impossible to make any fixed judgment of the time of the coming of the Scots to Britain, without being first assured of the truth of what the Irish writers have advanced of the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots in Ireland, and of the long succession of their kings down from Heremon, above a thousand years before the incarnation; in that case it seemed to me, as I have endeavoured to show,¹ that the first settlement of the Scots in Britain might be with an equal probability placed some three or four ages before the incarnation, as our writers have generally fixed it. But if the Scots were a foreign people, as Camden and other learned men are of opinion they were, and that they came into Ireland only about, or even after, the time of the birth of Christ, in that case the epoch of the settlement of the Scots in Britain must have certainly been as yet later; and on the time of their first settlement, that of the beginning of their monarchy in Britain necessarily depended.

This being the case, the examination of the antiquity of the first settlement of the Scots in Ireland, and by consequence that of the grounds of their remote antiquities, was unavoidable to one that had all along endeavoured to go, as much as possible, to the bottom of each subject that he examined. And being once engaged into this discussion, it led me insensibly much farther than I had at first intended; this obliged me, upon the resolution taken at last to publish this essay, to retrench a part of what concerned these remote antiquities, and to endeavour to soften the style and expression of what remains, so as it might give no just cause of offence to anybody.

And I have ground to hope that the learned, equitable, and considerate persons of that kingdom will easily observe that all that I have said upon the subject was, to the best of my knowledge, intended for the true honour of the Irish nation and of its history, by exposing impartially, as I have done in regard of my own country, what appears advanced without sufficient ground by the writers of their history of what passed before Leogare's time, and by laying before them the means that appear the most proper towards freeing their country from the

¹ P. 114, etc., *infra*.

reproach of too great credulity, and towards gaining reputation to their country and credit to their histories among the learned in foreign countries ; that is, 1. To make an entire distinction, as Sir James Ware and other learned men have done, betwixt the dubious or fabulous accounts, left by their bards, of their remote antiquities, and the certain history of what passed in Ireland since St. Patrick or King Leogare's time. 2. To publish, as all other polished nations have done, and continue daily to do, the genuine text of their Latin chronicles or annals, or a literal version of them, when in Irish. I mean particularly of those of Tigernach, Ulster, etc., and such others written in times of light and learning, which might be done on as little expense, and probably meet with more encouragement from the public than Dr. Keating's book, published within these few years ; which, whether the story it contains of their remote antiquities will serve for the true honour of Ireland, I refer to the learned, and those that know the true taste of these times.

In fine, as to what I have been obliged to say of these remote antiquities, I have ground to hope that no impartial man that reads with attention what I have said in this essay of the remote antiquities of my own country, as well as of those of Ireland, will accuse me of partiality. I may, indeed, have fallen into many mistakes, and doubt not but I have, as to the antiquities of Ireland, being a stranger ; but at least I meant well, and aimed only at truth.

20. It was chiefly the discussion of these remote antiquities, and of the time of the first settlement of the Scots in Ireland, which, together with the abstracts or remains of our own ancient history, forced me at last, not without great repugnancy, to lay aside what I had collected with no small pains, in order to support and render at least probable John Fordun's system of the antiquity of the settlement and of the monarchy of Scots in Britain, as it will appear in its proper place.

As to that of Boece, besides the other proofs against it, set down in their proper place, it might suffice, that until the year 1526, that his history was printed, I could hitherto never meet with any piece before that year, either printed or MS., containing, I do not say the lives and actions of his first forty kings, but their genealogy, such as he gives it—no, not even their bare names. Nor could I hitherto meet with any man that could say that he had ever seen either history or record, written before that year 1526, that contained either the genealogy or the names of the first forty kings, such as Boece found them in his Veremund, etc. As to Buchanan's history of those forty kings, it being a bare abstract of that of Boece, calculated to support the cause that he was embarked in, it must fall or stand with that of Boece.

21. It was not possible to enter into the discussion of the historical facts related by Boece from Veremund, and by Buchanan from Boece, without taking notice of the account that they deliver of the pretended judicial proceedings against so many ancient kings by their nobles and subjects, which hath given occasion to so many foreign writers to brand our nobility, and nation in general, with the reproach of having always been a seditious and rebellious people against their sovereigns; and I conceived that it was a duty I owed to my country to examine into the bottom of that reproach, and show how little ground there is in all that remains of more certain of our ancient history, for what the first of these two modern writers hath, out of too great credulity, and the last with a formed design and by principle, advanced on that subject.

22. The account which I have given in the last chapter of the essay, of the steps and degrees of the growth of our remote antiquities, was, besides the giving light to the subject, designed, not so much for a critic of Fordun, Winton, etc., as for an apology. And, indeed, if we consider the credit that the opinion of the Scots having been settled both in Ireland and Britain long before the incarnation (which was the source of all these remote antiquities) had obtained before their times, if we reflect upon the times, circumstances, prevailing opinions of the nation when those writers lived, we will be easily persuaded that they could not well write but as they did; and if we had lived and written on the subject in their times and circumstances, we should probably have been equally influenced with the common traditions of the times, and written accordingly. They wanted innumerable helps that we have; and the general practice of all other nations in those times was no less an encouragement to them to raise to the greatest height they possibly could the antiquity of the settlement and of the monarchy of the Scots, than in our times the common practice of all the more learned and polished nations in allowing their remote antiquities to be reduced to the just standard of truth ought equally to encourage both the Irish and Scots, in order to avoid the reproach of groundless credulity, to employ the learned of their country in the same service, to support its reputation among foreign nations.

23. Now, as to this small performance of mine, the favour, or if I may speak so, the justice, that I have to beg of my own countrymen is—1. That before they judge of it, or censure it, they would be at the trouble to read it all over in the order that I here give it. I have endeavoured to connect it from the beginning to the end into a continued series, and therefore no fixed judgment can be made of one part of it separately without

relation to the rest. 2. That they would consider whether, supposing the reasons and authorities which I have given, it was possible for me to make any other judgment than I have done of the systems of our antiquities drawn up by Boece, Buchanan, or even by Fordun; and, supposing these systems were not sustainable, whether I could with so lame accounts as we have of those times, set the ancient state of the inhabitants of our country on a more certain, at least a more likely and more honourable footing than I have endeavoured to place it, and that in the first book, which I designedly premised before I discussed the systems of our modern historians in the second. 3. That they would also consider, that what I have said against the accounts given of our history by Fordun, Boece, Buchanan, etc., concerns chiefly the remote antiquities of the Scots,—that is, the accounts they have delivered of the first forty or forty-five kings, and the other transactions before Fergus, son of Erch, and his immediate successors till King Aydan. For as to the succession of our kings from King Aydan downwards, and the few particulars of Scotish affairs of these times set down by Fordun, he being the most ancient continued historian that we have now remaining, he justly deserves a preference to all that came after him; and his credulity to the common opinions of his time concerning the remote antiquities of the Scots, ought not to derogate from his authority in his historical accounts taken from our ancient writers of Scottish affairs in following ages. The same thing I say in proportion of the authority of Boece, Buchanan, and the rest of our historians, in as far as their accounts are conformable to, or at least not contradicted by, more ancient writers. 4. That they would look upon this work, not as a finished piece, but as a simple essay, in which I have endeavoured to clear up the ancient state of our country, to separate what seemed fabulous and groundless from what appears more certain. And though I have been sometimes obliged, for want of vonchers, to make use of conjectures (all which I leave to the judgment of the learned readers), in all the more important occasions I have set down and quoted my authorities, and those either from authors already published, or from MSS. to which the access is easy; and I have printed in the Appendix such short MS. pieces as seemed more curious, or more proper to give light to the subject, and serve for proofs.

24. I easily foresee that in what I have endeavoured to settle in the first book there will be found difficulties, that throughout all this small performance there will be observed several mistakes. In carrying it on, I have been often reduced to the case of one travelling all alone through desert and uninhabited

places, without any beaten paths, or meeting with any person that could give him any certain directions in his journey; so if I have sometimes gone astray it will not surprise me, especially considering the variety of matters treated of in this essay.

25. It remains only now that I beg some allowance from the English reader for the style and expression. My chief attention was to make myself to be understood, and therefore I have all along endeavoured to follow a plain and simple style, without affectation. And though an honourable gentleman of my own country, and another learned English gentleman, were so kind as to revise the language, and to alter such exotic words or expressions as it was natural should drop from me, I doubt not but the English reader will still meet in this essay with too many marks of my native language and foreign education.

A CRITICAL ESSAY
ON THE
ANCIENT INHABITANTS OF THE NORTHERN
PARTS OF BRITAIN, OR SCOTLAND.

THE INTRODUCTION AND DIVISION OF
THIS ESSAY.

THE chief design of this essay, on the ancient state of the northern parts of Britain, so well known by the name of the kingdom of Scotland, being to serve for a foundation to an historical account of the first planting the gospel, and of the progress of the doctrine and discipline of the Christian church in those parts of the island, no method appeared to me more proper for giving light and order to the subject, than to treat separately of each one of the different people who anciently inhabited those parts.

What ven. Bede¹ says of this island in general, that in his time the knowledge of the sublime truths of religion was searched into and professed in five languages of as many different nations, was also true in Bede's time even of those northern parts of the island in particular which compose now the kingdom of Scotland, where Britains, Picts, Scots, and Saxons did actually then inhabit, as the Romans had done before, and left their language. And as the present inhabitants of Scotland are in their several provinces (as I hope it will afterwards appear) the offspring of these several ancient inhabitants, so the account of the actions, whether civil or religious, of these ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain belongs no less to the history of Scotland than that of the Scots that came from Ireland.

Nor is it singular in the present inhabitants of Scotland to be thus originally descended of several people, since there is

¹ Bed. Hist. lib. 1, c. 1.

not almost any kingdom or state in Europe, even of the most polished of them, but was originally at least as much a mixture of different nations, whom length of time, the same laws and government, and mutual alliances have by degrees cemented into one body of people. What a mixture of different origins in Italy, and in Rome itself,—almost of all nations ! And how few of them now can prove their descent from any ancient Roman family ! The same may be said of France, where there is a mixture of ancient Gauls, Romans, Franks, Goths, Burgundians, and Normans or Danes. The same thing more or less in Spain ; and in England, what a mixture is there of Saxons, Danes, Normans, Franks, and Flemings, besides the old Britains or Welch ! So it is no disparagement to the present inhabitants of Scotland to be in this like to other nations, originally descended of different people.

In order, therefore, to clear the way towards what I mainly aim at in this essay, I design in the first place to treat of each of those ancient inhabitants of Scotland apart—to give a short account of their settlement in this part of the island, of their government and several revolutions that happened among them, as far as I can find light from credible vouchers, till their ceasing at last to bear a particular distinct name of their own, partly by decay or retiring some of them elsewhere, partly by being incorporated into one nation and government with the other inhabitants under the common name of Scots, reserving withal the particular detail of their actions to the second or historical part of this essay.

This method of treating separately of each people that ancientsly inhabited Scotland will, besides other advantages, very much contribute to clear many debates arising both in civil and ecclesiastical history from the dubious sense of the words Scots and Scotland, by which, 1st, may be understood that people so called, their descendants and possessions in Britain, who, coming originally, as is thought, from Ireland, settled first on the north-western coast of what is since called Scotland, and who in progress of time, by alliances or conquest, were at last by degrees united with all the other northern inhabitants of Britain, of whatever origin, under one name of Scots, and in one monarchy called Scotland ; 2d, by these words, Scots and Scotland, may be meant, by anticipation, all those several nations, though of different origins, their descendants and possessions, who at any time in the most ancient ages had fixed habitations in those northern parts of Britain, afterwards called Scotland,—whose posterity, for anything we know, still remains, and makes perhaps at this day the greatest part of the present inhabitants of Scotland,—who, for that reason,

have equal claim to all the great men, of whatever origin, who anciently inhabited these northern parts of Britain, and distinguished themselves either by their warlike exploits or by the sanctity of their lives, as they have to those of the Scots that came from Ireland.

However, I shall endeavour in this essay to avoid, as much as I can, this anticipation in naming the several ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain, and shall design them by the names given them by the ancient writers that give the earliest accounts of them; and so I shall call them by the names of Britains or Maeats, Caledonians, Picts, Scots, etc., as I shall find them designed. But as to the whole country itself, to avoid the frequent repetition of the northern parts of Britain, having no other single name to give it but that of Scotland, I shall be obliged to make use of it sometimes by anticipation. And it ought to suffice that I give here an advertisement of it, not to be mistaken, as if I pretended that the whole country was called Scotland before the descendants of the Scots were fully masters and in possession of it.

In the account I intend to give separately of each of these people who anciently inhabited Scotland, I shall begin with the Romans, because the history of these northern inhabitants can never be distinctly understood without having first a general view or notion of the settlement of the Romans in Britain, of the division made of it by the Romans into provinces, and a more particular and distinct account of the several walls or fences erected by the Romans to defend the provincials against the northern unconquered nations.

In the second place, I shall give an account of the Midland Britains—those, I mean, who dwell betwixt the southern and northern walls—from the first distinct mention we find of them by the name of Maeats, and of the several revolutions happened among them till they partly retired elsewhere, partly became subject to, and were united into one people with, the Scots.

3d, I intend to treat more at length of the once famous people of the Caledonians, the same called afterwards Picts.

4th, I shall enter into a full discussion of all that concerns the Scots, and chiefly of the much controverted heads of the antiquity of the settlement and of the monarchy of the Scots in Britain; and in order to settle that controversy, I shall begin by examining the accounts of the first forty kings given by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers; and these being properly improvements of the scheme of the Scotish antiquities laid by John Fordun, I shall in the next place examine the grounds of this scheme, and from thence proceed to inquire into the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots, first in Ireland,

and thence into the north-western parts of Britain ; and conclude by endeavouring to fix the precise era of the beginning of the monarchy of the Scots in Britain.

As to the Saxons, who were the fifth people who had anciently possessions in Scotland, their history, in as far as it relates to Scotland, is naturally intermixed with that of the Picts and Scots.

I shall divide the whole into two books. In the first, I shall give account of the Romans, of the Midland Britains, and of the Caledonians or Piets ; and in the second, I shall treat at length of the Scots.

BOOK I.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE ROMANS, OF THE MIDLAND BRITAINS OR
MÆATS, AND OF THE CALEDONIANS OR PICTS, IN THE
NORTHERN PARTS OF BRITAIN, OR SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE ROMANS IN BRITAIN.

WE have little knowledge of Britain before the Romans entered it; and the surest accounts that we have of its ancient state being from the Roman writers, on occasion of the transactions of the Romans in the island, it seems necessary to premise some short account of their settlement in Britain, of its divisions by them into provinces, and particularly of the walls and fences which they built on their frontiers, in order to give more light to what we are to treat of the northern parts of the island.

ART. I.—*Of the Settlement of the Romans in Britain, and Divisions of it into Provinces.*

Julius Caesar was the first of the Romans that attempted the conquest of Britain, about fifty-five years before the birth of Christ, but he made no settlement. The Emperor Claudius began the conquest of it, and after him by degrees the conquest of the island was carried on in the southern parts, and the conquered Britains were civilised and modelled after the form of a Roman province. Their conquests were advanced to the northern friths by Julius Agricola, under Domitian; but that frontier was quickly lost, and the Emperor Adrian was content to settle the marches of the empire in Northumberland. Under his successor, Antoninus, they were carried back to the northern friths.

All this time it appears that the Roman conquests in Britain made but one province. Ziphilin, from Dio, gives ground to

think that in Severus' time they were divided into two provinces, the superior and the inferior. But it is certain that before Valentinian I. there were four Roman provinces in Britain, known by the names of Britannia prima, Britannia secunda, Flavia Cæsariensis, and Maxima Cæsariensis. 'Tis thought that Constantine the Great was author of this division of provinces; and we have an account of it from Rufus Festus,¹ who wrote under Valentinian I. In fine, under the same Valentinian the General Theodosius conquered anew the debateable lands where the Midland Britains or Mæats dwelt, betwixt the southern and northern walls, and erected them into a fifth province, called Valentia; and accordingly we find in the *Notitia Imperii*,² under Honorius' reign, these five provinces in Britain under their proper magistrates; and they remained much in the same state till the Romans abandoned the island.

But the most general division of the Britains in the Roman times was into provincials and extra-provincials. The first were those of the south, who became subjects to the Roman empire, were governed by its laws, reduced into provinces, and civilised according to the form of the Roman polity and manners. The extra-provincials were those of the north, who never submitted to the Roman yoke, but preserved their liberty, and continued to live according to their own ancient customs, and were therefore called barbarous by the Romans. These were particularly the inhabitants of Caledonia, on the north side of the friths of Clyde and Forth.

There was a third sort of Britains that dwelt between these two, and inhabited the countries betwixt the southern wall in Northumberland and the northern at the friths. These were sometimes at liberty, sometimes subject to the Romans, and other times overrun by the northern inhabitants of Britain, according as the Romans were strong in the island, and as the limits of the empire were advanced to the northern wall or confined to the southern; and therefore I shall call these countries betwixt the walls the Debateable Lands, and the people Midland Britains. They are called by Ziphilin, from Dio, by the general name of Mæatæ, and contained several lesser people within them, such as the Ottadini, Selgovæ, Novantes, Damnii, Gadeni, etc. About the year 368 they were, as we observed already, by the General Theodosius, under Valentinian I., reduced into a Roman province, by the name of Valentia.

It is of some importance to remark this general division of the Britains into three parts—to wit, the Provincials, the

¹ Rufi Festi Breviar.

² Nōtit. Rom. Imper., edit. Labbe, Paris 1651, p. 62.

Mæatae or Midland Britains, and the Caledonians or Britains of the north, called afterwards Picts, because it will serve to give greater light to what will be afterwards said at large of these two last people, who were the first known inhabitants of what is since called Scotland.

ART. II.—*Of the Roman Walls in Britain.*

As to the walls, fences, or barriers by which the Romans used to secure the frontiers of their conquests in Britain against the northern nations, their situation altered frequently, as the Romans were strong in Britain, and able to maintain or advance their frontiers ; and there is a great debate among modern writers about the situation of some of these walls, though generally all, or almost all, agree that all these fences and walls were built in one or other of these two places, either betwixt Tine and Carlisle on Eden, or betwixt Clyde and Forth.

We have an account of their having been settled, built, or repaired eight or nine different times : 1st, by Julius Agricola ; 2d, by the Emperor Adrian ; 3d, under the Emperor Antoninus ; 4th, by the Emperor Severus ; 5th, by Carausius, as is reported by the interpolator of Nennius ; 6th, by the General Theodosius ; 7th, by orders of Stilicho ; 8th, under Honorius by the Britains ; 9th, by Gallio,—of each one of which we shall give a short account.

1. Julius Agricola was the first of the Romans that carried on their conquests to Caledonia, and there is no dispute about the place which he fortified, intending to fix the marches. Tacitus,¹ his son-in-law, gives us an account from Agricola's own relation, that, finding the narrow neck of ground betwixt the friths of Clyde and Forth a proper place to fix the barriers of the empire, he fortified it with fences, so that the countries to the south of the friths were to remain subject to the Romans ; and the inhabitants of Caledonia, to the north of them, were by this barrier separated as in another island from his new conquests ; this was A.D. 81.

2. But this frontier was soon lost, and the Emperor Adrian, A.D. 121, having resolved to build a wall about forty years after Agricola, to secure the provincials from the unconquered nations of the north, thought fit to abandon all the midland countries from Northumberland to Caledonia, and was contented to fix the frontiers eighty miles farther south than Agricola had placed them, and so built his wall betwixt Newcastle on Tine and Carlisle on Eden, as appears by the dimensions given of its

¹ Tacitus, *vita Agricolæ*, n. 23.

being eighty miles in length, by Spartian;¹ and besides, as Camden and others remark, by the remains of Adrian in the names of places in these parts; nor is the situation of this wall much controverted.

3. The next wall was built, A.D. 138, by Lollius Urbicus,² under the Emperor Antoninus. It was built of turf, but fortified, no doubt, from place to place with castles or stone work. That this wall was seated betwixt Clyde and Forth, where Agricola had first placed his barrier, seems clear, as well from several inscriptions of Antoninus and Lollius Urbicus found in those places, as from the expressions of Capitolinus, from whom we have the account of this wall, who tells us that Lollius built it after forcing the barbarous nations to give ground; so that the frontiers being thus carried back to the friths, the debateable lands betwixt the two walls were anew joined to the empire.

4. The fourth wall was built by the Emperor Severus, A.D. 210, after he had forced back the Midlanders or Mæats, and the Caledonians, who had invaded or overrun several provinces of the empire. Dio and Herodian give us on this occasion a more distinct account of those two northern nations than we had hitherto met with; but of that in its proper place. I shall only remark here that Dio³ seems to include all the nations betwixt the walls under the name of Mæatae, by placing them next to the wall, and after them the Caledonians, whose ancient possessions were bounded by the northern friths; whence follows, as we observed elsewhere, that the possessions of the Mæatae were the debateable lands betwixt the walls, so often overrun alternatively by the Romans and northern nations.

To return now to Severus' wall. There is much debate among modern writers about the place where this wall was situated. The most general opinion is that it stood in Northumberland, betwixt Tine and Carlisle, where Adrian had formerly built his wall; others will have it to have been seated where Agricola had placed the first fences against the northern nations—that is, betwixt the two friths of Clyde and Forth, where Antoninus' wall was erected.

Buchanan,⁴ who is the chief abettor of this last opinion, gives no other considerable reason for it but that there were conspicuous remains in his time (which as yet do subsist) of a Roman wall betwixt Clyde and Forth, and inscriptions found

¹ ‘Britanniam petiit, in qua multa correxit, murumque per octoginta millia passuum primus duxit, qui Barbaros Romanosque divideret.’—*Spartian in Adrian.*

² ‘[Antoninus] Britannos per Lollium Urbicum Legatum vicit, alio muro cespitito submotis Barbaris ducto.’—*Jul. Capitolin. in Antonin.*

³ Dio, p. 866.

⁴ Buchan. in Donald 1.

that show it was a Roman work; but that proves only that there was a Roman wall in that place, and we have seen already that both Agricola's fences and Antoninus' wall were built there; and all the inscriptions found there prove the wall to have been under Antoninus, and never any inscription found in that place of Severus; nor does Buchanan mention any of his. Besides, we shall see a third wall built there of turf and stone by the Britains, A.D. 422.

A more likely proof of Buchanan's opinion is drawn from the vulgar editions of Eutropius, and another abridgment of the Roman history under the name of Aurelius Victor, who both give to Severus' wall but thirty-two miles in length, whence it would follow that it was not situate betwixt Tine and Carlisle, where there are about eighty miles, considering the various turns and windings of the wall, from sea to sea, but that it was built betwixt Clyde and Forth, where Buchanan places it, and where the distance is only about thirty miles.

But first, as to that abridgment of the Roman history, under the name of Aurelius Victor, the author is uncertain, as well as the time he lived in; and the genuine and undoubted work of Aurelius Victor, as we shall see presently, gives much the same account of Severus' wall as Spartian¹—that it was bounded on each side by the ocean, without any further account of its dimensions.

As to Eutropius, though the vulgar editions give but thirty-two miles to Severus' wall, there is just ground to believe that the ancient copies had a c or L before the numerical letters XXXII., since St. Hierome, near Eutropius' time, who follows him, hath CXXXII. Orosius about the same time gives the same dimension; and after them Cassiodorus, Ado, Nennius, and others, who gave all CXXXII. miles to Severus' wall, in which it is highly probable that the numerical letter L hath been, by error of the transcriber, altered into that of c, these two letters being easily confounded in ancient MSS., and there being no place in Britain that hath CXXXII. miles of breadth, which hath apparently given occasion to critics to cut off the c in the editions of Eutropius; whereas there's no likelihood of St. Hierome's adding c to the number he found in Eutropius.

Among the more ancient historians, Dio and Herodian, who lived near Severus' own time, in their accounts of his reign make no particular mention of his building a wall, though Dio² speaks in general of the wall that separated the provincials from the northern nations, upon occasion of the Maeatae or Midland Britains, who, he says, dwelt next the wall, and the Caledonians next to them; from whence would follow neces-

¹ Spartian in Sever.

² Dio, edit. Wechel, p. 866.

sarily, if Dio means in this place the wall built by Severus, as it is very probable he doth, that it was situate in Northumberland, since the Mæatae, according to Dio, were bordered by the wall on the one side and by the Caledonians on the other, that is, on the north, and so the wall he speaks of must have been on the south of the Mæatae.

Spartian, who wrote under Dioclesian, though he marks not expressly either the dimensions or place of the wall, yet his telling us that it was the greatest¹ ornament of Severus' reign, that he had from it the surname of Britannicus, and that it was bounded at both ends by the ocean, insinuates plainly enough that it was not the short wall in Scotland, bounded by the Friths of Forth and Clyde, but that of Northumberland, above twice as long, and bounded on both sides by the ocean. Aurelius Victor, in his true work already mentioned, seems entirely of the same opinion. The passage where he speaks of the wall is introduced from a comparison of what Severus had done in Britain for the security of the empire, with his other great victories over the Persians, the Arabians, the Adiabenæ, and then he adds² his *majora aggressus*, etc. Severus undertook a nobler work than all that, for having overcome the enemies of the empire in Britain, he fortified it against them by building a wall across the island, bounded at each end by the ocean.

But though the matter were dubious in others, one would think that the authority of Bede³ should decide in what he attests from the inspection of the remains of the wall as well as from the tradition of his time, that Severus' wall was built in Northumberland; and, accordingly, this is the uniform sentiment of almost all the modern British writers, such as Usher, Camden, Stillingfleet, Langhorn, etc., as well as of our Scottish writers, Fordun, Major, Boece, Chambers, Leslie, and all except Buchanan, whose reasons, as we have seen, prove nothing for his opinion.

But the most considerable objection against the situation of Severus' wall in Northumberland is drawn from what Dio says of Severus' treaty with the Mæats and Caledonians—to wit, that he had forced them to peace because they had lost a considerable part of the country; so the vulgar version of Ziphilin's abridgment of Dio hath it.⁴ Now it appears by what is said above that Lollius, under Antoninus, had settled the

¹ 'Britanniam (quod maximum ejus imperii decus est) muro, per transversam insulam ducto, utrinque ad finem oceani munivit. Unde etiam Britannici cognomen accepit.'—*Spartian in Sever.*

² Aurel. Victor. de Cœsarib.

⁴ Dio, p. 867 c, edit. Wechel.

³ Bede, lib. 1, c. 12.

marches of the empire in Britain seventy years before, at the Friths of Clyde and Forth; so that if Severus' wall was in Northumberland, far from gaining ground on the northern nations, on the contrary it would follow that he had yielded to them very considerable territories—to wit, all the debateable lands, from the southern to the northern wall, which had formerly belonged to the empire.

To this, I conceive, may be answered, in the first place, that the Greek of Ziphilin imports only in general that Severus had forced the northern nations to retire from no small territories, meaning those of the British provinces which they had invaded, occupied, and ravaged; for this incursion of the northern nations was, as Herodian remarks, the chief pretext or occasion of Severus' expedition; so that his beating out these enemies of the empire of all the Roman provinces in Britain, seems to be all that this passage of Dio or Ziphilin imports.

And as to Severus' placing his wall rather in Northumberland than where that of Antoninus stood, it may be answered, that in the same manner as, notwithstanding that Agricola had fixed the marches of the empire at the northern friths, yet Adrian, forty years afterwards, thought it safer to settle them in Northumberland, and there built his wall; because the Romans, though they looked upon all betwixt the walls as belonging to them, yet found these debateable lands could not be protected by the short wall betwixt the friths from the continual inroads of the northern nations, who easily passed over these narrow friths; so Severus, though he had chased the enemies out of the Roman provinces, and not only subdued the Maeats, but overrun the Caledonians, and forced them to a peace, yet when it was a question of settling the barriers again where the strength of the Roman forces in Britain were to reside, he judged it much safer, as Adrian had done, to fix the wall and garrisons in Northumberland; and, no doubt, it was for the same reason that the chief forces of the empire in Britain, which always lay upon the frontiers, might not be at too great distance from the centre, but nearer at hand to join the rest of the forces placed up and down in divers stations, and so be able to repulse any intestine commotions or revolts. Besides, that the barriers of the empire being settled in Northumberland did not hinder the Maeats beyond it, and perhaps even the Caledonians, from being obliged by Severus to promise subjection as a condition of peace. And it is like, that the indignity of that treaty obliged first the Caledonians and then the Maeats to revolt and shake off the yoke immediately upon Severus' returning to York, as Dio relates.¹

¹ Dio, p. 867.

To conclude, there may be, I conceive, a further proof of Severus' wall's being situated in Northumberland and not at the friths, drawn from a passage of Dio, who wrote soon after Severus' death. Dio, or Ziphilin from him, informs us that the Romans possessed in the island of Britain at that time only the lesser part of the island : ‘*Cujus (Britanniae)¹ pars paulo minus quam dimidia Romana erat.*’ Whereas, if Severus' wall had been placed betwixt the northern friths, and included the debateable lands, the Romans would have been in possession of about two-thirds of the island; but this is too much on that subject, we proceed now to the other walls.

5. Carausius, who usurped the empire in Britain towards the end of the third century, is said to have also built or repaired the wall, A.D. 289; but I find no better authority for this than that of the interpolator of Nennius,² who places Carausius' wall betwixt Clyde and Forth, near the river Caron.

6. In the year 367, the Emperor Valentinian I. sent over the General Theodosius to Britain against the Picts and Scots, who had invaded the Roman provinces, and ravaged them for several years.³ Theodosius coming suddenly on them put them to flight, and having recovered the debateable lands betwixt the two walls, he erected them into a new Roman province by the name of Valentia, which made a fifth province in Britain, as hath been already remarked. Theodosius, to secure this new province for ever to the empire, fortified again the frontiers, and placed garrisons to defend them against the northern nations. These new fortifications being at the extremity of Valentia to the north, could be no other than the fences and walls of Agricola and Antoninus, betwixt Clyde and Forth, repaired again and put in a posture of defence.

7. It was also in the utmost bounds of Valentia, where Antoninus' wall stood, that Stilicho⁴ caused the marches of the empire to be fortified, A.D. 398, against the invasions of the Scots and Picts, who, as Claudian relates, had broken loose again and were destroying the British provinces; but Stilicho sent over forces who repulsed the enemies, and remained a safeguard to the frontiers till recalled by Stilicho himself,⁵ A.D. 402, at the battle of Pollentum; so they left the poor provincials a prey to their enemies for many years.

8. About the year 421, the Romans, called in by the Britains to their help against the Picts and Scots, after having beat them out of the Roman provinces, upon their return home ordered the provincials, for their security, to build or repair

¹ Dio, p. 367.

² Nennius, cap. 19, edit. Gale.

³ Ammian. lib. 27.

⁴ Claudian, lib. 2, de Laudibus Stilichonis.

⁵ Claudian, de Bello Getico.

the wall betwixt them and the Picts and Scots. This wall, the Britains, not being skilled in that kind of structure, built of turf more than of stone, so it proved but of little use to their defence.

Bede¹ gives a distinct account of this wall,—that it was situated betwixt the Friths of Clyde and Forth, and began at a place called Peneltun in Saxon, and Penual in Pictish (Nennius calls it Cenual, perhaps Kinnel), about two miles distant from Abercorn, and ended towards the west at Alcluyd, or Dunbritton, on the Frith of Clyde. Bede says that it was very broad and very high, and that the remains of it were in his time. And to this day there are still considerable remains of it to be seen, and this is what Buchanan took for Severus' wall.

By the situation of this wall it appears the marches of the British provinces continued still at the friths, where they had been settled, A.D. 370, by the General Theodosius' erecting the province of Valentia, which remained still in possession of the provincial Britains, but frequently harassed and ravaged by the Picts and Scots.

These ravages and oppressions obliged the Britains, about the year 426, to solicit again the assistance of the Roman forces; and they being come under the command of Gallio, slew great numbers of the Scots and Picts, and put the rest to flight; and having thus rescued the Britains, told them that they could not any more bring over forces to their succour, that therefore they ought to take arms themselves and train up their people to military discipline; and for a further encouragement to them, the Romans caused a stately wall to be built, not of turf, as the former, but of stone, eight feet broad and twelve feet high, from sea to sea, betwixt the towns which had been formerly built there to keep off the enemy, and in the same place where Severus had formerly built a wall. This the Romans caused to be built or repaired on public expense.

As to the place where this last wall was situated, Gildas, the oldest writer that speaks of it, does not precisely mark the place, though to any that will consider impartially his expressions, where he speaks of the two last walls, it will appear that this last was in a different place from the former, built or repaired, as we have seen, A.D. 420. He says this last, of the year 426, was built betwixt the towns from sea to sea, that is, bounded on both sides by the ocean, whereas the first was built betwixt two seas or friths. Besides, that the author of the *Capitula Gildæ*,² published by Dr. Gale from an ancient ms., says expressly that the first of these two last walls was betwixt

¹ Bede, lib. 1, c. 12.

² Capit. Gild. c. 9, p. 3, edit. Gal.

Kaer-eden, a most ancient city, within two miles of Abereorn towards the east, and ending at Alcluyd, or Dunbritton, towards the west; and that the last wall was at a great distance from the first, built in Northumberland, and began at Wallsend, near Tinnmouth, and ended at the sea of Galloway, that is, Solway Frith. Fordun¹ hath much the same description of both these walls.

But nothing is more clear than venerable Bede² for this last wall's being situated in Northumberland, both by his telling it was built in the same place where Severus' wall stood, that is, in Northumberland, as we have shown above, and more expressly by his informing us that it was hard by the monastery of Hagulstad or Hexham, which stands nigh the ruins of the wall in Northumberland. In fine, this is the general opinion of the most learned among the English writers, such as Camden, Langhorn, and Stillingfleet.

Only Buchanan confounds the situation of these two last walls, and supposes they were both placed betwixt the Friths of Clyde and Forth, where he had formerly placed Severus' wall, without any other reason, as we remarked in its place, than that there were still remains of a Roman work in that place.

This singular opinion of Buchanan's as to the placing the last wall betwixt the friths, is readily embraced by the learned Usher,³ as furnishing a strong argument against the Scots being at this time settled in Britain. Usher's reasons for placing this last wall betwixt the Scottish friths, and not in Northumberland, are these conjectures:—1st. That it is not likely that the Romans would oblige the Britains to abandon a tract of ground of about eighty miles (to wit, all the countries betwixt the northern and southern walls), which they must have done if they built the last wall in Northumberland. To this Dr. Stillingfleet⁴ gives a very reasonable reply, that in all probability the Britains were then willing to let their enemies have the more room, to prevent their being disturbed by them; and this so much the more, that the Romans had declared to them they were no more to look for any relief from them against the oppression of these invaders. Besides, that the Romans as well as the Britains had reason to suppose that at least the Picts or Caledonians would never be content nor at rest till they were left in quiet possession of some part of that tract of ground of which they had so often before been masters, and that they looked upon as violently taken from them about fifty years before by the General Theodosius to be erected into

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, cc. 3 and 67.

³ Usher, Antiq. Brit. p. 317.

² Bede, lib. 1, c. 12, and lib. 3, c. 2.

⁴ Stillingfl. Antiq. of Brit. Ch.

a new province. On this account it was very advisable for the Britains to abandon this debateable ground, and accordingly, as Gildas¹ remarks, as soon as the Romans were gone, the enemies took possession of all this tract of ground up to the wall.

2d. Usher objects that it is not likely that the Romans would have put the Britains on building a long wall of eighty miles in length, such as that of Northumberland, whereas they might with less forces, time, and expense have built up or repaired the short wall betwixt the northern friths, which last would also require fewer hands to defend it.

To this it is answered—1st. That in the place where this wall in Northumberland was built there had been already two walls, that of Adrian and that of Severus, as we have shown; that there were also towns from place to place built of old, so the labour was less than if it had been quite a new work, the wall being rather to be repaired than built again. 2d. That this wall, according to Gildas and Bede, was built on public as well as private expense by the Roman army as well as by the Britains; and so considering the number of workmen, as also the public contributions, the work was neither laborious nor expensive to particular persons. As to the difficulty of defending a long wall, that requiring more hands than a short one, it is answered, that it was not hands but hearts that failed the Britains; and this wall being built *inter urbes*, from town to town, which were nigh one another on these marches, it was not harder to defend this wall than it would have been to defend the northern wall, where we do not read that the towns were so frequent, so that each town served for a guard to the wall in its neighbourhood.

Besides, that the northern wall, as Bede takes notice, was of no use at all to keep off the enemies, who, leaving it untouched, passed easily over the narrow friths; whereas the long wall in Northumberland secured all, being built *a mari ad mare*, bounded on each side by the ocean. And this is sufficient to answer Usher's conjectures, which after all are not to be put in balance with Bede's authority, which Usher owns to be, in the situation of this wall, expressly against his opinion. So that upon the whole we may conclude this last wall was built in Northumberland.

After the building of this wall, the Romans left Britain and never returned back to it again, and this concludes their expeditions into this island, as their empire in it had ceased some eighteen years before; and here I shall conclude this short view of their settlement, provinces, and walls in Britain, neces-

¹ Gild. c. 15: 'Omnem aquilonalem, extremamque terrae partem pro indigenis muro tenuis capessunt.'

sary for understanding more distinctly the state of the northern nations, the most ancient inhabitants of what is now called Scotland, of whom we are now to treat in particular, and first of the Midland Britains.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE BRITAINS IN SCOTLAND, OR MIDLAND BRITAINS.

ART. I.—*State of the Midland Britains in the Roman times.*

Among the ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain, or Scotland, the first place in order of time is due to the Britains. This name in ancient authors was common to all the ancient inhabitants of North as well as South Britain, even of Caledonia, the inhabitants whereof are often called simply Britains by the first Roman writers before their proper name was commonly known to them, because they dwelt in the island, and resembled in their customs and language the southern Britains, before these last were totally subdued by the Romans and civilised by them. Besides the Caledonian Britains, who preserved their liberty, and never were subject to the Roman yoke, there were many of the southern Britains upon the Roman invasion that, to preserve their freedom, fled from their country and possessions and joined the Caledonians, and became by degrees one people with them.

But it is neither of those kinds of Britains I intend to treat of in this place; I reserve that to the dissertation concerning the Caledonians or Picts. My intention here is to discourse of those Midland Britains whom Dio, or Ziphilin from him, call Maeatae, who dwelt betwixt the Northumbrian wall and the Caledonians, and possessed the debateable lands betwixt the two walls, which, by the General Theodosius under the Emperor Valentinian I., were, A.D. 370, reduced into a Roman province by the name of Valentia. These Britains, known by the proper name of Maeatae, included under them several lesser people, such as the Ottadini, Selgovae, Novantes, Damnii, etc. Their country was commonly the field of battle betwixt the Romans and northern nations, afterwards betwixt the Saxons and Picts, who had each of them possessions in it, and at last became all a part, as it is still, of the kingdom of Scotland, except what lies of it betwixt Tweed and Tine in Northumberland. These

people, whom for distinction sake I shall call Midland Britains or Mæats, though I know not how long they bore that last name after Dio's time ; these people, I say, from the Romans' settlement in the island, were sometimes at freedom, sometimes subject to the Romans, and oftentimes overrun and subjected by the northern unconquered nations.

The Mæats were first invaded and subjected, A.D. 82, by Julius Agricola, who settled the marches of the empire betwixt the two northern friths ; but that subjection lasted no longer than Agricola remained in the island, and the Mæats enjoyed their liberty under the following emperors till A.D. 138, that Lollius Urbicus, under Antoninus, carried back the marches of the empire to the Friths of Clyde and Forth. But that lasted also but a short time, for we find that under the Emperor Commodus,¹ about A.D. 183, both the Mæats and Caledonians had broken in upon the empire, and after harassing the provinces, killed a Roman general that opposed them, and though repulsed by the General Marcellus, they continued in arms till Severus the emperor came himself in person, A.D. 208, into Britain against them.

Severus overran both the Mæats and Caledonians, and exacted submission of them ; but he was not well returned to York when first the Caledonians (as Dio remarks) and then the Mæats shook off the yoke. Severus died soon after, and his son Caracalla left the Mæats as well as Caledonians at liberty, and returned home ; and from that time forward it appears the Caledonians possessed themselves of a part of the Mæats' lands, or rather, united to the Mæats, shared in their possessions to the south of the friths, till Theodosius reduced that country, as we remarked, into a province, A.D. 370, and from thenceforth the Mæats became subject to the Romans, though it appears that country was continually harassed by the Caledonians or Picts, as also by the Scots. We shall observe elsewhere that the Picts or Caledonians had still a claim to a part of it, and about A.D. 426, after the building the last wall, and the Roman forces' final retreat, the Picts settled at least in all the southern parts of the Mæats' country, and took possession of it as their own up to the Northumbrian wall. The Mæats or Midland Britains, becoming either subject to or united with the Picts, and retiring towards the more western parts, had their chief seat at Alcluyd, or Dunbritton.

Besides these Midland Britains, formerly called Mæatae, who dwelt in Valentia, it cannot be doubted but numbers of the southern or provincial Britains retired and took shelter with them upon the Saxons' invasion after the middle of the fifth

¹ Dio, lib. 72, p. 820.

century; and the Saxons encroaching daily more on the Britains, and possessing themselves by force and great cruelty of all the best provinces of South Britain, forced the ancient inhabitants to abandon their country and seek refuge either in the extremities of the island, or even out of it.

ART. II.—*Of the Kingdom of the Midland Britains.*

It appears by the testimony of ancient writers that the Midland Britains had for several ages not only a dwelling, but a little kingdom of their own, called Regnum Cambrense or Cumbrense, extending on the western coast from Dunbritton and the northern wall to the southern wall in Northumberland, and that the chief seat of it was that impregnable rock or castle, called Alcluyd, Areclud, Petra Cloithe, the same that is now called Dunbritton, from them.

Joceline,¹ who wrote in the twelfth age the life of St. Kentegern or St. Mungo, dedicated to Joceline, bishop of Glasgo (who died A.D. 1199), calls these possessions of the Britains in the west of Scotland Regnum Cambrense, and says this kingdom in former times was extended from the Northumbrian wall to the Scotish sea of Forth or Clyde, that is, from the southern wall to the northern; and what the preface to the ancient² chartulary of Glasgo hath of the founding that see, insinuates the same.

That the Britains of those parts had proper kings or princes of their own, is likewise proved from the aforesaid and other ancient monuments. The life of St. Gildas, published by F. Mabillon,³ from a manuscript of the library of the Abbey of Fleury, gives account that in the fifth age Gildas was born at Arelyd or Dunbritton; that his father Caunus, others call him Navus, was king of that country, and he was succeeded by his son Hoel.

St. Elred, abbot of Rieval, in the life which he wrote of St. Ninian, about A.D. 1150, speaking of these western parts of Scotland, where St. Ninian was born, says that it was certain, not only by the testimony of histories, but by the memory of

¹ ‘Diocesis vero episcopatus ejus [S. Kentegerni] secundum limites Cambrensis regni extendebatur; quod utique regnum sicut vallum quondam a Severo principe a mari, usque ad mare . . . & usque ad flumen Fordense pertingit, etc.’—*Joc. vita & S. Kentegerni*, ms. Bibl. Cotton. Vitell. D. VIII.

² ‘In Cumbria itaque regione quadam inter Angliam & Scotiam sita; fide catholica in illis climatibus exuberante & propagante; domestici fidei ac proceres regni cum rege provinciae co-operante in honore Dei & sanctae Mariæ pie genetricis, ecclesiam Glasguensem, sedem scilicet pontificalem Cumbrensis regionis, fundaverunt.’—*Præfatio Chartul. Glasg. sive inquisitio de possessionibus ecclesiæ Glasg.* fol. 1, ms. in collegio Scotor. Paris.

³ *Vita S. Gildæ in actis Benedictini*, tom. I.

men, that these western countries had a proper king of their own till the end of the Saxon or English times, that is, till the Norman invasion : ‘ Usque ad novissima Anglorum tempora, proprium habuisse regem, non solum historiarum fide, sed & quorundam quoque memoria comprobatur.’¹

Joceline² also, in the above-mentioned life of St. Mungo, tells that, in St. Mungo’s time, in the sixth age, Marken was king, otherwise Marcus, by whom the saint being ill-used, retired to Wales, but returned back to Glasgo, being invited by the pious King Rederic or Roderic, one of Marken’s successors.

But of this King Rederic we have an undoubted account from St. Adamnan³ in St. Columba’s life, who relates that this Rederic was son to Tothail, that he was a particular friend of St. Columba, and that he reigned in the sixth age at Dunbritton, *apud Petram Cloythe*.

Langhorn⁴ gives us a series of seven or eight kings of these Midland Britains who lived after this Rederic, succeeding one another down to Dummael, about the middle of the tenth age ; but however dubious that succession may be, we are assured from better authority that the Britains⁵ were in possession of Alcluyd, or Dunbritton, till A.D. 756 ; that Egbert, king of the Bernitian Saxons, and Oengus, king of the Picts, took it from them on conditions.

Afterwards this country of Clydesdale and Galloway became a prey to the Picts, Danes, Scots, and Saxons ; and the mixture of so many nations, with their daily wars one against another, obliged many of the inhabitants to leave their country, and reduced the rest of them to that state of barbarity and anarchy which, in the time of King Alexander I., his brother Prince David, afterwards king, found among them, and began to put a remedy to these disorders by resettling the episcopal see of Glasgo, as it is related in the preface to the old chartulary⁶ of that church.

There is no doubt but the frequent incursions of so many enemies, and their oppression, may have obliged some of the British inhabitants of these parts to retire elsewhere, as Humphry Lhuyd⁷ says they did in the ninth age, and as it is mentioned by the aforesaid preface of the chartulary of Glasgo ; but it is also certain that many of these Britains, who were now called Welch, Walenses, did remain in or about

¹ Vita S. Niniani per *Ælredum*, ms. Bibl. Cotton. Tiber. D. III.

² Jocelin, vita S. Kentegerni, c. 22, 31.

³ Adamnan, vita S. Columbae Abbatis, lib. 1, c. 15.

⁴ Langhorn, de regn. Engl. ad calcem. Idem, p. 239.

⁵ R. Houeden Chr. ad hunc annum.

⁶ Chartular. Glasg., fol. 1.

⁷ Ludd. Fragment. Brit. Descrip.

Clydesdale, Galloway, and other western countries of the diocese of Glasgo, not only after the time that Humphry fixes their transmigration, but that even down to the twelfth age they were still known in the diocese of Glasgo, by the name of Welch, Walenses, as a distinct people, though long before subject to the kings of Scotland.

That the Welch or Britains were still inhabitants of Clydesdale or the adjacent countries in the year 875, appears by what Asserius, the Saxon Chronicle, and other ancient writers relate of Halfden the Dane, with his army, their incursion that year upon the Piets and Stratcludenses, as Asserius calls them, or Stratclæd-Weales, as the Saxon Chronicle relates. That this incursion was not on Britains or Welch, in Flintshire, as Camden interprets it, but on those in Scotland, seems manifest by what all ancient English writers that speak of this incursion relate of Halfden's march. That the Danish army, then about Tine, divided in two bodies, whereof the one went southward the other northward, commanded by Halfden; that this last army ravaged and burnt on their march Northumberland and Holy Island, which was not in their march to Flintshire, but in that to Scotland; and then they add that they attacked the Piets and Stratcluds or Stratclud Welch, joining them both in one incursion or expedition as a neighbouring people, by which I think it is evident that these inhabitants of Stratclyd or Clydesdale were not a people dwelling on the little river Clud in Flintshire, above a hundred miles from Galloway, which about these times was the chief seat of the Piets, but a people dwelling about Clyde in the west of Scotland, the ancient seat of the Britains, and in the neighbourhood of the Piets.

ART. III.—*The Walenses or remains of the Midland Britains in the Western parts of Scotland, incorporated with the Scots.*

But we have as yet more evident proofs that the remains of the old Midland Britains were, even in the twelfth age, inhabitants of the diocese of Glasgo, and known there by the name of Walenses (Welch, a common name to all that spoke the British language) as a distinct people; we have, I say, proof of this from authentic charters of our kings, Malcolm IV. and William, recorded in the ancient chartulary of Glasgo, which are addressed to their subjects of the diocese of Glasgo, in this tenor:¹ ‘Francis & Anglicis, Scotis & Galwejensibus, & Walensibus, & omnibus ecclesiae S. Kentegerni de Glasgo, & ejusdem episcopi paroehianis.’ 1st. It is clear these charters or precepts for paying the tithes are addressed to the diocesans

¹ Chartul. vit. Glasg., fol. 52, etc.

of Glasgo only; 2d. It is certain that the diocese of Glasgo, though formerly it contained Cumberland in England, was extended only to the borders of Scotland in these kings' time, and ever since the erection of the seat of Carlisle, A.D. 1133; so there were at this time inhabitants of all these nations within the diocese of Glasgo, and they are otherwise known in history. By 'Franci' are understood the French and Normans, whereof several families had obtained possessions and establishments of our kings in this diocese and other parts of their kingdom. The 'Anglici' are the remains of the Saxons settled here. The 'Galwejenses' were most part Picts, as we shall observe; and the 'Walenses' could be no other than the Welch, or remains of the old Midland Britains, still distinguished from the rest of the inhabitants by their language, and as yet known by the distinct name of Welch, given in those days to all that spoke that language in Britain. And Buchanan¹ informs us, at least he seems plainly to import, that as yet, in his time, many of the inhabitants of Galloway spoke the Welch or British language, which was their native tongue; and I have heard that some of the commonalty of that country, in the remote creeks of it, continue as yet to speak a particular language, different from the vulgar tongue of the Scots; but I could get no certain information of it.

However, since the twelfth age we have no further mention of the Walenses or Welch in those parts as a distinct people, they being insensibly so united with and incorporated into one people with the rest of the inhabitants of that country, that in the following ages they appeared no less eclipsed or vanished than if they had all left the country; and thence come the expressions of Luddus' fragment of the British antiquities, and that of the preface to the chartulary of Glasgo, that the remains of the old Britains or Welch, in the western parts of Scotland, had been by the invasions and ravages of the Picts, Saxons, Scots, and Danes forced to leave their country.

Besides, that these western countries where the Britains dwelt, as well as the rest of the kingdom, having been by St. David and the following kings daily more polished by wholesome laws, and reduced to a regular form of government, the inhabitants, though of different origins, were by degrees cemented together, and with the Scots, into one body of people; and from the eleventh age downwards, the Saxon or English tongue being become the language of the court, both because

¹ 'Sequitur in eodem latere, & littore occidentali Gallouidia: quam vocem & Scottis & Vallis Gallum significare est perspicuum, ut cui alteri a Gallo, alteri a Vallo nomen dedere. Valli enim Wallowithiam eam appellant. Ea magna ex parte patro sermone adhuc utitur.'—Buchanan, lib. 2, fol. 21, edit. Arbuth.

all our kings from Malcolm Keanmore downward till King Alexander II. had been all bred up some time in England, and learned the language, and all of them married English princesses ; and because many of their great men, not only the Saxons and Normans that came in from England to Scotland under the reigns of these kings, but others following their example, spoke the English tongue, as many of the inhabitants in the southern parts had done before ; and thus the English language daily prevailing, wore out by degrees the Welch language in the west, as it did the Pictish all over, and daily reduces the old Scotish or Gaelic to narrower bounds ; so all distinctions of the old Britains or Welch in the western parts of the kingdom from the rest of the Scots being worn off, the whole inhabitants of these parts came by degrees only to be known by the name of Scots, common to the rest of the subjects of the kingdom ; and the different families have been of a long time so interwoven, if I may say so, by mutual communication and intermarriages, during the space of five hundred years, under the name of Scots, that it is no wonder that they cannot now distinguish their origins, but look on themselves as Scots, and as having always been so.

But that hinders not that great numbers of them are originally Britains, and perhaps many more of them of British extraction than of Scotish. Hence the inhabitants of these countries, though now and of a long time reputed Scots, may claim by as just a title, St. Ninian, St. Patrick, St. Gildas, St. Mungo, and other ancient natives of these countries, famous in former ages, for their countrymen, as if these great men had been all descended of the Scots.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE CALEDONIANS OR PICTS.

I am now come to the second inhabitants of North Britain in order of time, the ancient, warlike, and once most powerful people of the Picts or Caledonians, who preserved their liberty against all the power of the Roman empire at the height of its grandeur. I shall endeavour to be the more particular in the account of this ancient people, that nothing is more important for setting in a due light the ancient state of Scotland ; and that, I hope, it will appear that the present inhabitants of that

kingdom are much more concerned in the ancient Picts than their modern writers give them to understand.

To give this subject all the clearness I can, I shall reduce it to the following heads, and treat—1st. Of the antiquity of the settlement of the Caledonians in Britain. 2d. Of the occasion of the name of Picts being afterwards given to them. 3d. Of their origin, and whence they came to Britain. 4th. Of their language. 5th. Of the extent of their dominions in Britain. 6th. Of the nature of their government. 7th. Of the series of their kings. 8th. Of the union of their kingdom with that of the Scots. 9th. Of the continuation of their name and race, till they were incorporated into one people, and under one name, with the Scots.

ART. I.—Of the antiquity of the settlement of the Picts in Britain; that they were the same as the Caledonians, and the most ancient and first known inhabitants of the northern parts of the island.

Modern critics are divided in their opinion about the antiquity of the settlement of the Picts in Britain—some looking on them as new inhabitants, long after the peopling the northern parts of the island; others esteeming them the first known inhabitants, and the offspring of the ancient Britains of the north, so well known during the times of the Romans by the name of Caledonians, so called from their country Caledonia, which, according to the Roman writers, included all these northern countries of Britain separated from the southern by the Friths of Clyde and Forth.

That the Picts were not a foreign people come in upon more ancient inhabitants, but the first known people of the north of Britain, and originally Britains of the north, is what I intend here to establish, as being grounded both on the testimonies of the Roman histories, from whom we have the most ancient accounts of them, as also on that of Bede; though the abettors of the Picts being a quite different people from the Caledonians, draw their chief arguments from Bede, which shall be examined.

It is agreed on, that the most ancient writer that gives us any distinct account of the inhabitants of Caledonia is Tacitus, in the life of Agricola; and it appears from him that they were looked upon as the most ancient inhabitants of Britain, since Tacitus,¹ speaking of them, says it was uncertain whether they were *advenæ* or *indigenæ*, though he inclines to think they came originally from the neighbouring countries called Germany. It

¹ Tacit. vit. Agric. p. 231: ‘Rutilæ Caledoniam inhabitantium comæ, magni artus Germanicam originem asseverant.’

must be also granted that they were in Tacitus' time very populous, since they soon made up an army of thirty thousand men, able to dispute their ground with the Roman forces, so well disciplined, and commanded by so able a general as Agricola. It is likewise certain, that though the Romans had the better of the Caledonians, they neither destroyed them nor reduced their country into provinces, and that the fruit of their victory was lost as soon as Agricola left the island ; that they continued long after that so numerous and formidable enemies to the Romans, that, far from attacking them again, the Romans were obliged, A.D. 124 under Adrian, and 138 under Antoninus, emperors, to erect walls and trenches to protect the Roman provinces from the inroads of the Caledonians; that they had broke through these walls, A.D. 183, in the reign of Commodus, and ravaged the provincials ; that notwithstanding the advantages which Ulpius Marcellus, sent by Commodus, had over them, they broke in again upon the Roman provinces, so that, A.D. 208, the Emperor Severus himself went with the strength of the Roman army against them, and after the loss of fifty thousand Roman soldiers in overrunning their country, he was content at last to treat with the Caledonians and Maeats, and erect a new wall for stopping their inroads ; and twenty years after Severus' death, the Caledonians were looked upon as such formidable enemies, that Dio¹ tells us, in his account of the disposition of the Roman legions, about the year 230, that the Romans kept two legions on the borders against these unconquered Britains, whereas one legion sufficed to keep all the rest of the Britains in subjection.

By all this it is evident that hitherto, that is, till about the middle of the third age, the Caledonians, far from being exhausted or weakened by their wars against the Romans, continued still a people as formidable to the empire as ever. So there was no place for new inhabitants to come in upon their ruins and people their desert country ; and the Caledonians appear all along hitherto too jealous of their liberty to suffer foreigners to encroach upon them, as is pretended by those² writers that would make the Picts a new people, come in about the third age, and settled in Caledonia, because we do not meet with the name of Picts given to the inhabitants of Caledonia till about the end of the third age or the beginning of the next. We shall afterwards (when we examine the origin of the name of Picts, Art. III.) give the reason why that name was first given to the ancient Caledonians, precisely towards the end of the third age, without any alteration among them.

But to prove how directly that those called in the end of the

¹ Dio, lib. 55, p. 564.

² Stillingfleet's Antiq. Brit. Ch. pp. 240, 241.

third and in the following ages by the new name of Piets, were not a new people lately settled in the island, but the same called hitherto Britains of Caledonia or Caledonians, we shall begin with the Roman writers who lived in those times.

Dio,¹ in the account he gives of Severus' expedition against the northern unconquered nations, calls the country Caledonia, and the people Caledonians, to whom he joins their neighbours the Maeats. Herodian,² in his account of the same expedition, written about A.D. 240, calls the same inhabitants of Caledonia simply Britains ; but he describes them Piets, or painted, in these words : ' They mark their bodies with various pictures of all manner of animals, and therefore they clothe not themselves, lest they hide the painted outside of their bodies.' This description that Herodian gives of these warlike Britains or Caledonians agrees perfectly with that which Claudian in the end of the next age gives of them by the name of Piets, and shows that Herodian, A.D. 240, and Claudian, about the year 400, had both the same people in view, and by consequence that the Caledonians and Piets were one and the same. For thus Claudian³ describes them :

‘ Ferroque notatas
Perlegit exanimis Picto moriente figuras ; ’

and in another place, giving account of the General Theodosius' victories, he speaks thus of the Piets :⁴

‘ Ille leves Mauros, nec falso nomine Pictos
Edomuit ’—

where it is to be remarked that Claudian says they were not without reason called Piets, or painted Britains, intimating evidently that their custom of painting or marking themselves was the cause of the Romans giving them that name ; but this will more clearly appear when I come to speak afterwards of the occasion of their getting that name precisely in the end of the third age.

2d. The first Roman writers that call the inhabitants of Caledonia by the name of Piets in the end of the third and beginning of the fourth age, assure us at the same time that these very people whom they call Piets were one and the same with the Caledonians.⁵ Eumenius the orator, in his panegyric to Constantius, A.D. 297, is the first writer extant who calls the North Britains by the name of Picti ; and the same author in another oration, pronounced eleven years afterwards in presence

¹ Dio, edit. Wechel, p. 866.

² Herodian, lib. 3.

³ Claudian de bello Getico.

⁴ Claud. Paneg. in. 3, Cons. Honor.

⁵ Panegyrici veteres.

of the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 308, tells us the Caledonians were a part of the Picts: *Non dico Caledonum aliorumque Pictorum.* By which, as we see, that as the Caledonians were Picti or painted, so there were also other people of the northern parts of Britain who for the same reason bore the same name of Picti, to wit, the rest of the unconquered nations of the north. And this is further confirmed and cleared by Ammian Marcellin,¹ in his history, written towards the middle or latter end of the fourth age, who is the second author that speaks of the Piets, and tells us also that the Caledonians, or, as he calls them, the Dicaledonians, were one part of the Piets or painted nations, and the Vecturiones another. From all this it seems clearly to follow that the people who began first in the end of the third and beginning of the fourth age to be called Piets by the Roman writers, were not new inhabitants in the island, but all one and the same ancient inhabitants of these northern unconquered provinces, so well known in former ages by the name of Caledonians, or Britains of Caledonia.

3d. My third proof of the Piets being not (new) inhabitants, but of their being themselves the most ancient and first known inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain, is from Bede, in the account he gives us of the first settlement of the Piets in Britain from the common tradition in his time. After having told us that the first inhabitants of the south parts of Britain came from Armorica (now called Little Britain in the Gauls, and settled in the south parts of the island), he adds, that whilst they were multiplying and spreading themselves from the south of the island, the Piets came into Britain and took possession of the north. His words are:² ‘Et cum plurimam insulae partem (incipientes ab Austro) possedissent (Britones) contigit gentem Pictorum de Scythia (ut perhibent) longis navibus non multis oceanum ingressam,’ etc.; and after telling us that they first landed in Ireland, and not finding a settlement there they came over to the north of Britain and established themselves: ‘Itaque petentes Britanniam Picti habitare per septentrionales Insulae partes ceperunt: nam austrina Britones occupaverant.’ From which passages it seems plainly to follow—1st. As to the antiquity of the Pictish settlement in North Britain, that it was not very long after the first plantation of the southern parts thereof, since these first inhabitants were but as yet taking possession of the island; and though they had already planted with inhabitants a good part of it, beginning from the south, they were not yet multiplied so as to spread to the north. 2d. That the northern parts of the island, where the Piets settled, were as yet uncultivated and void of inhabitants when they

¹ Ammian. lib. 27, p. 346, l. 30.

² Bede, lib. 1, c. 1.

came in, the Britains having only taken possession of the southern parts. *Nam austrina Britones posse derant.*

This, I conceive, to any impartial man that considers attentively the text of Bede, will appear to be his meaning; and all I pretend to show by it is, not that any certain proof can be drawn from an author so late as Bede for the first plantation of the island, but only that it was the current opinion of the natives in Bede's time that the people who in his time were known by the name of Picts were the first and most ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain, which is sufficient to confute any other writers posterior to Bede, especially when it does not appear that they had been at greater pains to inform themselves than Bede seems to have been at. So that what we find of the Picts coming into Britain only after the times of Christianity,¹ in some of the English or British writers of later ages, copying one another, and all originally from Jeffrey of Monmouth or such other writers, ought to be looked upon, if not as altogether fabulous, yet at the best that they were only foreign colonies coming in upon the Picts long after their first settlement in Britain; though what we remarked already, and shall have occasion to relate more at length of the number and strength of the Picts or Caledonians in the three first ages of Christianity, seems to leave no room for it.

By all we have said I hope it is sufficiently proved that the Picts were not new inhabitants upon a more ancient people, but the first known inhabitants of the north of Britain, and by consequence the same so famous in the Roman historians by the name of Caledonians, or Britains of Caledonia.

It remains now to make this system agree with other passages of Bede, which are the chief arguments of those writers² who pretend that the Picts are not the ancient inhabitants of Britain, nor the same as the Caledonians, but a people quite different, come in long after, about the third age, upon the decay of the Caledonians or Britains of the north, exhausted by their wars with the Romans. It is then objected, that in Bede's opinion the Picts could not be the Caledonians or Britains of the north, since he never gives them those names, but on the contrary everywhere supposes or describes the Picts as a people quite different from the Britains in their origin, in their language, in their customs, etc.

But if Bede's passages be well considered, the times distinguished, and all equivocal terms removed, it will, I hope, appear that Bede's account is in reality no ways inconsistent,

¹ Usher, Brit. Ant. pp. 303, 304, 308.

² Stillingfleet's Ant. of Brit. Ch. pp. 240, 241.

but agrees with the Roman writers, who give us the earliest accounts of the first inhabitants of the north of Britain.

I shall examine afterwards apart what relates to the country whence the Picts came originally, and what concerns their language. I am here only to consider the objections in general, drawn from Bede, against the Picts being in ancient times the same as the Caledonians, or a part of the Britains.

And first, it is objected that Bede never calls this northern people by the name of Caledonians ; but that only proves that Bede, who wrote in the eighth century, was so little acquainted with some Roman writers, that he never once mentions that the northern parts of Britain were called Caledonia ; by which it appears that he had not seen either Dio, or Tacitus, etc., but took his information from later writers, and from people of his own time. In a word, he generally supposes that the inhabitants had, in all former ages, borne the same names they were known by in his ; so with him, the inhabitants of North Britain, called Piets long before his time, are called Picts at their first coming to plant the north of Britain ; so also in his time the inhabitants of Ireland were promiscuously called Scots, and therefore he calls them so at the time he supposes that the Picts first settled in Britain ; but his not calling the Picts by the name of Caledonians proves no more their not having had originally that name, and being the same people, than his never calling their country Caledonia proves that the north of Britain was never so called.

2dly. It is objected that not only Bede never calls the Picts by the name of Caledonians, or of Britains, but that he all along treats of the Britains and Picts as two people entirely distinct and opposite. In order to clear this, it must be observed that the name of Britains, applied to the inhabitants, may have several distinct meanings or applications, as hath been elsewhere here observed. 1st. Britains in general denote all the ancient inhabitants of the island of Britain, whencesoever they came and wheresoever they settled at first in the island, whether in the south or the north. In this sense the inhabitants of Caledonia, or of North Britain (called afterwards Picts by the Romans, about the end of the third age), were, both before and after that time, frequently called Britains by the Roman writers,¹ as being equally inhabitants of Britain as well as those of the south ; and in the same sense Bede himself, who never calls the whole island by any name but that of Britain, would have made no difficulty to have called all the inhabitants of the north as well as those of the south by the same name, if the obligation to speak the common language of his time, and

¹ Tacitus, Herodian, etc.

call things by the names then most in use, had not obliged him, for clearness' sake, to call each people by the names they were then, and many ages before, best known by. 2d. By Britains, or Britons, are meant those inhabitants of the southern parts of the island, on this side the friths, who became subject to the Romans, and were by them reduced into provinces, and therefore known by the name of provincial Britains; who, upon the Romans retiring out of the island, in the beginning of the fifth age, being sadly overrun by the unconquered nations of the north, called in the Saxons to their aid, and were soon after mastered by them, and forced to retire for shelter, some to Wales, others to Clydesdale, others to Brittany in France. In this sense the Picts, or inhabitants of North Britain, not only were not Britains, but were ever, since these Britains became subject to the Romans, their constant enemies. And it is in this sense that Bede makes use of the name of Britains, and treats of the Picts as a people quite distinct from them.

What is said here of the distinction of Britains and Picts in Bede's time, may, in some measure, answer the same objections drawn from the manner after which Gildas, long before Bede's time, speaks of these two peoples; with this addition, that Gildas speaks of the Picts with so much the more invidious characters and bitter expressions than Bede, because Gildas looked on the Picts and Scots as the first authors of all the calamities which the poor Britains suffered in his time from the cruelty and ravages of the Saxons, whose getting a footing in the island was wholly owing to the frequent invasions made on the Britains by the Picts and Scots.

After all, by what we have said in this article, and what we have further to add in the next, to prove that the Picts were not, as Dr. Stillingfleet¹ and others suppose, a foreign people come in upon the decay of the Caledonians, but only a different name given to the Caledonians and other unconquered people of the north of Britain, and by consequence the most ancient inhabitants of these parts,—by all this, I say, I do not pretend that from the first settlement of the Caledonians in those northern parts they never received any strangers among them in lesser numbers. For, besides that it cannot be doubted but several of the Britains of the south, to be free of the Roman yoke and preserve their liberty, retired and joined the Caledonians in their wars against the Romans, and were incorporated in one state and body of people with them, it is not unlikely that the stories of the three comings in of the Picts to Britain, mentioned by Usher² from writers of later ages (in case there be any real

¹ Stillingfleet, p. 240.

² Usher, Antiq. Brit. pp. 303, 304, 308.

ground for them of better credit, and more ancient than Jeffrey of Monmouth), may have been occasioned by some little colonies coming in to them from the northern continent, and received by them as auxiliaries. But all those, if such there were, being far inferior in number to the ancient Caledonians or Picts, have been incorporated into one body of people with them, without any derogation of the antiquity of the settlement of the ancient inhabitants, or causing any alteration in their ancient name; in the same manner as we see the many Saxon, Norman, and other families, who, especially in the eleventh and twelfth ages, came into Scotland, were received by our kings, Malcolm Keanmore, his children and successors, and got lands and possessions from them, were so incorporated into one people with the rest of the subjects, that were it not for the address made use of by our kings, Edgar, Alexander I., David I., Malcolm, and William, in some of their charters, which bear Anglis, Francis, as well as Scotis and Galwejensibus, and the accounts we have from the history of the times and the private writings of some families,—were it not, I say, for these records, all these families, though originally come from France, England, or other countries, are some ages ago so cemented with the rest of the Scots, that far from making any alteration of the name of the Scots, they have lost their own original name, and many of them the memory of the country of their origin, are equally reputed Scots as the most ancient inhabitants, and are only known by that name. And as the coming in of these strange families derogated nothing from the antiquity of the Scots, so neither did any foreign colonies derogate from the antiquity of the Caledonians, in case any such did come into them.

ART. II.—*Of the occasion of the name of Picts given to the Caledonians or Britains of the north.*

That the people who began to be called Picts in the third and after ages were truly and properly the same people with the Caledonians and other ancient Britains of the north, will as yet further and more distinctly appear by examining the origin or first rise and occasion of the name of Picti or Picts in Britain, and showing that it was not originally the proper name of the people so called brought in with them to the island, or a name which they gave themselves, but a general denomination given by the Romans, in or about the third age of Christianity, to the Caledonians; and not to them alone, but to all the ancient unconquered inhabitants of North Britain, from their continuing the custom of painting or marking figures on their bodies as a mark distinguishing them from the provincial or

conquered Britains, who, upon submitting to the Roman laws and polity, had laid aside the use of painting with the rest of their former customs, esteemed barbarous by the Romans. And this name of *Picti* being once fixed by the Romans and provincial Britains that spoke the Latin tongue, and appropriated to the northern unconquered inhabitants, was afterwards retained with little alteration in the vulgar tongues by the Britons and Saxons, as were the proper names of cities; and the same name was expressed in the equivalent term of *Cruithneach* by the Irish and ancient Scots. All which, I hope, will clearly appear by the following observations:—

1st. It is to be remarked that, before the Romans entered Britain, and till by their settling their government there they had polished the Britains by degrees as they subdued them and reduced them into provinces, all the Britains of the south as well as those of the north had the custom of painting themselves, or marking their bodies, as Cæsar¹ and Mela remark, who both of them wrote before the Romans had made any fixed settlement in the island. And even the name of the island itself seems derived from that custom, for *Brith*, according to Camden, signifies paint; and *Tannia* in the Celtic language (which is the mother tongue of the British) signifies, according to Pezron,² country. So that Britannia originally signifies the country of the painted or figured people. Upon the whole, it appears that in the earliest times, whilst the Britains lived as yet according to their native customs, before the Romans entered, the Britains of the south were no less *Picti*, painted, than those of the north; but then there was no occasion for their being called *Picti*, the custom being common to them all, the name would not have served to distinguish them.

2d. That the Romans, establishing their polity, customs, and manners among those they subjected to the empire and reduced into provinces, and abolishing those customs of the conquered nations that appeared barbarous to them and opposite to their manners, such as that of painting or making figures on their skins, it happened that this custom of painting being laid aside by the southern Britains by degrees as the Roman conquests advanced towards the north, and as their polity was settled among them, and remaining at last only among the Caledonians and other unconquered nations of the north, it was very natural for the Romans and those that spoke their language to give the name of *Picti* or *Picti Britanni* to these last, to distinguish by one remarkable name all the unconquered Britains from the provincials who

¹ Cæsar's Comment. lib. 5; Pomp. Mela, lib. 3, c. 6; Solon, c. 35.

² Pezron, Antiq. des Gaules, pp. 378, 418.

had left off that custom of painting or making figures on themselves.

The truth of this origin of the name will as yet appear more clearly if it be considered that it was in the end of the third age that we find this name of Picti first given to the Caledonians and other Britains of the north by the orator Eumenius, and that there was a particular reason why the Romans gave them that name in the third age rather than before, because the custom of painting or making figures on themselves began in the third age to be a more remarkable distinction betwixt the provincials and extra-provincials than ever before.

The Emperor Severus' expedition into Britain was in the beginning of the third age. From the wars of Julius Agricola, under Domitian, till Severus' time, the Romans had never entered Caledonia, having enough to do to defend their provinces in Britain against the northern nations: we do not find that they attacked them but in their own defence. Severus' ambition to have the surname of Britannic carried him farther, and intending a conquest of the whole island,¹ he entered Caledonia, and marched his army, though with almost incredible loss, to the farthest extremities of the north of Britain. The Romans who followed him in this expedition, and penetrated to the utmost bounds of Caledonia, had more occasion than ever before to know the manners and customs of the northern inhabitants, and to remark more particularly that they were all painted or marked with figures, as Herodian,² an author of that time, in the very account of this expedition describes them. The Romans at the same time observing no such custom among the provincial Britains, who had time out of mind laid it aside, it was natural for them, seeing all the extra-provincials painted or coloured, and none so but them, to give them the name of Picti, which in one word comprehended all the different extra-provincial Britains, and served to distinguish them by one common name that included them all from the provincial Britains. And so it happened; for Herodian, though he describes them painted or coloured, yet still continues to call them Britains, as his contemporary Dio calls them Caledonians in the account they have given us of Severus' expedition. The first Roman writer after that expedition that mentions these northern unconquered nations calls them all by one common name of Picti, Piets. This was the orator Eumenius, who in the year 297, in an oration before the Emperor Constantius, calls these nations for the first time Picti; and in another oration, as we have already remarked, pronounced A.D. 308, eleven years after, in the presence of Constantine, tells us that the

¹ Dio, edit. Wechel, p. 867.

² Herodian, lib. 2.

Caledonians were only a part of the Piets or painted Britains, and thereby giving us to understand that *Picti* was now become the general name to all the northern unconquered nations. The same extent of the name of *Picti* appears also in Ammian, as we observed elsewhere.

From what we have said, I hope manifestly appears the natural reason of this new name of *Picti*, given to a people so well known to be the ancient inhabitants of these northern parts, that the same Eumenius,¹ the first time he mentions them, supposes it as a thing well known that they used to have wars with the Britains before the coming in of Julius Cæsar, and this he advances in the presence of the emperor and chief officers of the empire lately come from Britain. I hope also what is said above suffices to discover the particular occasion of the Romans giving this new name of *Picti* to the northern Britains precisely in the third age, after Severus' expedition into these northern parts of the island.

Now this name being once given them by the Romans, and continued by the provincial Britains, who spoke their tongue, down to the Saxon invasion, it was as natural for the Britains and Saxons to retain the name, though originally Latin, in their vulgar tongues, with alterations according to their different idiotisms, as to retain so many names of towns and countries and so many other words derived from the Latin, particularly the names of things whereof the Romans had introduced among the Britains the first use: so the Britains or Welch, of course, called all these northern people, their ancient enemies, Phychthead; the Saxons named them Pehts or Pyhtas; and the Irish and ancient Scots expressed the same thing in equivalent terms of their language, calling them Cruithneach, from *Cruith*, which signifies forms or figures, such as they used to paint or mark on themselves.

And now I hope what I have said in this article of the occasion of the Caledonians being called Piets will appear to impartial readers a sufficient answer to Dr. Stillingfleet's² first objection, that he does not understand why the continuing an old custom should give the Caledonians a new name. The next objection he makes is, What makes the Roman writers so suddenly alter their style, and exchange a name so famous among the Romans (as that of Caledonians) for the name of Piets, which was not heard of before? This query is also in a great measure answered by what we have said already, to which I add, that the Roman writers did not alter their style on a sudden, as the objection supposes, but by degrees. Eumenius is the first that calls all the northern unconquered nations by

¹ Eumen. Paneg. 9.

² Stillingfleet's Antiq. Brit. p. 240, etc.

the name of Picti; but he still continues to call a part of them by their old name Caledonians [*Caledones aliique Picti*¹], and they continue to be so named by Roman writers in the end of the fourth age, Dicaledones;² and here also they are only a part of the Picts, painted or unconquered nations of the north. And this seems the true reason why the Roman writers ceased to call them Caledonians, at least why we meet not with that name after the fourth age given to these unconquered nations, who are all commonly from that time called Picti, as being all comprehended under that common name. Whereas the name of Caledonians, comprehending only a part of the Picts, or unconquered nations, grew out of use by degrees, especially after the Scots who came from Ireland began to make a figure in Britain, and were known to the Romans as the common enemies of the empire in conjunction with the Picts. And from that time both the Roman and British writers comprehend under the names of Picts and Scots all the northern nations who had never been subjects of the Roman empire. And the lesser people, whose proper names we find in former writers, being either become subject to or united into one people with the Picts, or the Scots, or the Britains of the north, we hear no more of the naines of any other nations in Britain, after the coming in of the Saxons in the fifth age, but of the Britains, the Picts, the Scots, and of the Saxons. At least this is the style of Gildas and of Bede, who seem to have read neither Tacitus, nor Dio, nor any Roman writer who mentions Caledonia or the Caledonians.

ART. III.—*Of the Origin of the Caledonians or Picts, and from whence they first came into Britain.*

As to the country from whence the Caledonians or Picts came first into Britain, Bede³ says that the report was in his time (*ut perhibent*) that they came originally from Seythia; and in this he is generally followed by later writers. But whereas the said Bede writes, and it is commonly agreed on, that the Britains of the south came from the opposite coasts of the Gauls, from this, his giving a different origin of these Britains and of the Picts, is formed a new objection against what we have endeavoured to prove in the foregoing articles of the Picts being the ancient Britains of the north. But if this were of any weight, it would equally prove that the Silures, a people of South Britain, were not Britains, because Tacitus⁴ thinks that they came originally from Spain. As if the greatest

¹ Eumen.

³ Bed. lib. 1, c. 1.

² Ammian, lib. 27, p. 347.

⁴ Tacit. vit. Agric. n. 11.

part of the Britains of the south, because they came in originally from the opposite coasts of the Gauls, were more justly entitled to the name of Britains than the other ancient inhabitants of the island, though they had come at first from different countries.

It was not, then, the coming to settle in Britain from one country rather than from another that gave the inhabitants of the island the name of Britains (for all of them at the first plantation of it must have come in from some foreign country or other), but their being the first known inhabitants of the respective provinces of Britain, whether south or north, gave them equally a right to that name. Hence the Picts being, according to Bede, as we have seen, the first inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain from whatsoever country they came, were by their being ancient inhabitants of the island no less entitled to the common name of Britains than the inhabitants of the southern parts of the island.

But to come now to the country that was the origin of the Caledonians or Picts. If we suppose the conjectures of Tacitus and of Bede to be well grounded, it will appear that the first inhabitants of Caledonia came originally from the ancient Chersonesus Cymbria, or Scandia, so famous for sending abroad numbers of people, that Jornandes¹ calls it justly the workhouse of nations, *Officina Gentium*. And whereas Tacitus² conjectures that the Caledonians came out of Germany, and Bede, who calls them Picts, by the name they commonly bore in his time, says it was reported that they came from Scythia, this difference may be easily reconciled by explaining the meaning of these two writers.

Tacitus,³ in his description of Germany, includes in Germania Magna, as well as Pomponius Mela, all the northern nations of the European continent even to the ocean, containing an immense extent, and many islands unknown to the Romans. On the other hand, Bede, following the ancient geographers, such as Strabo,⁴ as also Diodorus⁵ and Pliny,⁶ supposes that Scythia Europaea extended to the utmost bounds of the north, and includes among the Scythians the ancient inhabitants of Norway, Sweden, Danemark, the Daci, Getæ, etc. So that in reality Tacitus and Bede differ only in name, but both agree in the same opinion that the Caledonians or Picts came in at first from the opposite coasts of the northern parts of the European continent, which Tacitus includes in Germany, and Bede in Scythia.

¹ Jornandes de rebus Geticis, lib. 1, c. 4.

² Tacit. vit. Agric. n. 11.

³ Tacit. de morib. Germanor. n. 1, 2.

⁴ Strabo, p. 507.

⁵ Diodor. lib. 6, c. 7.

⁶ Plin. lib. 6, c. 13.

Now supposing that there were any good ground for the opinion of these two writers, which they themselves give only as a conjecture or hearsay, and that we had any certainty of the Caledonians or Picts having had their origin from the more northern parts of the European continent, it were an useless as well as an endless discussion to examine in particular from which of all the northern nations of the continent the first colony came to Caledonia, because that these nations of the north were almost in perpetual motion and changing habitations, as Strabo¹ remarks; and he assigns for it two reasons: the one because of the barrenness of the soil,—they tilled not the ground, and built habitations only for a day; the other, because, being often overpowered by their neighbours, they were forced to remove. Another reason why it is impossible to know from which of those nations the northern parts of Britain (supposing they came from thence) were at first peopled, is because we have but very lame accounts of these northern nations from the Greek or Roman writers (from whom alone we can look for anything certain in those early times), especially of those of Scandia to the north of the Baltic Sea, as the same Strabo² observes. Besides, it appears that Caledonia was peopled long before the inhabitants of these northern parts of the continent were mentioned or even known by the most ancient writers we have, and perhaps before the first nations mentioned by them were settled in those parts.

But if, notwithstanding the ignorance we are left in by the most ancient Greek and Roman writers of the inhabitants of the northern continent in the most early times, any conjecture may be drawn from the customs of these nations when they begin to appear in certain history, it would be a confirmation of the Caledonians being come into Britain from those northern parts of the continent, that we find, by the first Roman writers who mention them, the custom of painting or imprinting figures on their bodies, which is the most distinctive character of the Caledonians still in use in the first age of Christianity among several of these people of the northern continent.

Such were the Arii, mentioned by Tacitus,³ the Agathyrsi⁴ and Geloni; and these last are also mentioned by Solinus,⁵ who gives the same character of them and the Getæ as he does of the Picts. And though those people lived, for the most part, when these authors wrote of them, at a distance from the northern coasts, yet we know not what changes might have happened in their habitations from the time of the first planting the north of Britain till that of these writers.

¹ Strabo, p. 231.

² Ibid. p. 234.

³ Tacit. de mor. Germ. p. 223, ed. Lips.

* Virg., Georg. lib. 2.

⁴ Solin. c. 25.

But as all that I have advanced hitherto in this article of the origin of the Caledonians from Scandia, or other northern parts of the European continent, hath no other ground but a conjecture of Tacitus' and Bede's hearsay (*ut perhibent*), I must own that it appears much more natural and more probable that the Caledonian Britains or Picts were of the same origin as the Britains of the south; that as these came in originally from the nearest coasts of the Gauls, by degrees as they multiplied in the island, and peopled the southerly parts of it, they advanced towards the more northerly, and seated themselves there, carrying along with them the same customs as the Britains of the south, as also the same language, derived originally from the Celtes or Gauls. And Tacitus¹ himself seems at last to come into this opinion, for after his conjecture about the origin of the Caledonians and of the Silures, he adds, without exception, as to all the Britains in general, that it was more credible or likely that the Gauls from the neighbouring coast had at first peopled the island. This seems more natural, for so the earth was peopled at first. Men, as their number increased in their first habitations, being obliged to advance forward to new ones in their neighbourhood—to transport themselves not only over rivers, but over the narrow passages of sea, at first only to the nearest lands or islands, which they could easily discern from their own coasts, before they durst venture on sea voyages out of sight of land, especially in those early times when men were so ignorant of the art of navigation; so it is much more probable that the first inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain came rather from the southerly parts of the island than from Scandia, or other parts of the northern continent, at the distance of several days' sailing from any part of Britain.

This origin of the Caledonians is confirmed by the account that the Roman writers Herodian, Dio, and even Tacitus himself in other places give of them, by their calling them ordinarily by the name of Britains, and by their treating of them as a part of the Britains, without other distinction than that of their being seated in the most northerly part of the island, Caledonia, and of their having maintained their liberty with greater courage and unanimity than the Britains of the south against the power of the Roman empire. This character of the Caledonian Britains appears eminently in the noble harangue which, according to Tacitus, the famous Galgacus made to his countrymen assembled in battle against Agricola's army. He tells them they were the most noble among the Britains

¹ ‘In universum tamen aestimanti, Gallos vicinum solum occupasse credibile est.’—*Tacit. vit. Agric.* n. 11.

(*nobilissimi totius Britanniae*), who had never beheld slavery, much less undergone it,—which is the only difference he puts betwixt the Caledonians and Britains of the south. In fine, Herodian never calls these of the north but Britains, though he describes them to be Picts; and Tacitus himself, who calls their country Caledonia, never gives the inhabitants of it any other name but that of Britains.

ART. IV.—*Of the Pictish Language.*

Having in the foregoing articles shown that the Picts were the same people with the Caledonians, and that the Caledonians, or Britains of the north, were originally the same people with the Britains of the south, it follows, of course, that their language in ancient times, and before the Romans were settled in Britain, was the same—to wit, British.

And even though we should suppose that the Caledonians or Picts had their origin from the northern parts of the European continent, as Tacitus seems to conjecture, and as it was reported to Bede, that would not hinder the Caledonians from having originally had the same language as the Britains, since it appears that the Celtic language, whereof the British is a dialect, was in use in ancient times in the farthest extremities of the north; at least the Celtes or Celto-Seyths were extended to these parts, for Strabo tells us that the ancient Greek writers called all the northern nations Celto-Seyths or Seyths; and Tacitus¹ assures us that in his time the Gallic tongue was in use among some of these northern people, such as the Gothini, and the British tongue among others, as the Æstii.

But we need not go so far off to seek the origin of the Caledonians, or of their language, having already shown that it is much more natural, and better grounded in authority, to think that the Caledonians were a part of the Britains of the south, and that both of them had in common their origin from the nearest coasts of the Gauls, and by consequence the language of the Caledonians must have been originally the same as that of the Britains of the south.

However, it is no wonder that the long habitation of the Romans, mixed with the Britains, caused such alterations, both in their manners or customs and in their language, as to make the Caledonians or Picts, after several ages, appear a people of a different origin and different language; and these alterations, no doubt, gave occasion to Bede,² a stranger to the languages both of the Britains and Picts, to express himself in the manner

¹ Tacit. de morib. German., edit. Gronov. n. 43 and 45.

² Bede, lib. 1, c. 1.

he doth, both of the people and of their tongues, in that famous passage where he says in his time there were in Britain five languages of five people—to wit, the English or Saxon, the British, the Scots or Irish, the Pictish, and the Roman or Latin, where, among others, he makes both the British and Pictish people and their language quite distinct. For though Bede might know some words of the British and Pictish languages, as we see he did, yet it required a greater knowledge of them than can be supposed in a native Saxon to be able to discern by their analogy that they were originally but different dialects of the same mother tongue; and, after all, Bede spoke as properly in calling them distinct languages as one would do in calling the English and Germans different languages, there having been, without doubt, as great an alteration in the British tongue from the time of the Romans being settled in the island, as there is in that of the English since the Norman conquest.

For though, before the coming in of the Romans, the Britains both of the south and of the north spoke one and the same language, yet after their having been, from the time that the Romans settled in the island, about six hundred years before Bede's time, not only in quite different interests, and separated from one another, but that the Britains of the south, by their long subjection to and mixture with the Romans, had learned their language, and received in their own a multitude of new words and expressions from the Latin, as well as new arts and sciences unknown to the northern Britains or Caledonians, together with an accent and pronunciation quite different from theirs,—all this, in length of time, must have naturally made such alterations in the British language as to make the British and Pictish appear as different one from another as the English doth from the Dutch or German—in a word, so as not to be understood one by another. So it is no wonder that Bede, a stranger both to the British and Pictish, took them for different languages.

But that did not hinder his learning several words of both languages; for we nowhere find a clearer proof of the Pictish language being the same with the British than in Bede,¹ where he tells us that Penuahel in Pictish signified the head of the wall, which is just the signification that the same two words, Pen and Uahel, have in the British. But to render the proof drawn from the equivalency of sense or signification of the same words in the British and Pictish languages more clear, it is fit to observe—1st. That all the words that we know of remaining of the Pictish tongue are names of places. 2d. That all the northern provinces of Britain, at least from the Friths of Cluyd

¹ Bede, lib. 1, c. 12.

and Forth to the Orknays, were (as we shall show¹) the ancient dominions of the Caledonians or Picts till about the eighth or ninth age (excepting what the Scots possessed in the north-western parts of the island). So all the old words or names of places in those parts which formerly belonged to the Picts, at least those that are not Gaelic or Irish, must be Pictish; and if they prove to have the same signification in the British tongue, the conformity of those two languages will more clearly appear.

Thus Aber, which signifies in the British tongue (as Camden observes) the fall or mouth of a river or brook, is most frequently used, in those parts of Scotland which the Picts formerly inhabited, in the same signification, as Aberdeen, Abernethy, Aberbrothock, and a multitude of others. The same thing may be said of the word Strat or Strath, which in the British tongue, as the same learned author remarks, signifies a valley having a river or brook running through it, and is very common in Scotland in the same sense, as in these words, Stratherne, Strathdie, Strathdone, Strathyla, Strathawin, Strathspei, Strathbogy, and many others; and since these words are not old Scotish or Irish, and that the South Britains never dwelt in those parts, they must be Pictish, and by consequence are a new proof of the conformity of the British and Pictish languages. And I make no doubt but a person well skilled in the British tongue would, by observation, find many more words common to the British and Pictish languages in these northern parts of the island formerly inhabited by the Picts, notwithstanding that many names of places are so altered and corrupted by length of time, and by changes of possessors and inhabitants, that they appear quite different from what they were originally or in former ages. Thus two of the most famous places in the Pictish times, Abernethy in Stratherne, the chief seat, as it is believed, of the Pictish kings, and Forteviot, another habitation of the Pictish and Scotish kings, both of them now inconsiderable villages, were formerly very differently written,—the one Apurnethige,² the other Fothurtabaicht,³ as may be seen in the appendix of ancient pieces at the end of this work. And I believe the many names of old places in those parts which now begin by the syllable For, as Forfar, Forres, Fordyce, etc., may have formerly been written Fothur or Fothuir; and it is in that way of writing that the true meaning of the word must be sought. The same thing may have happened to such names of places in the north as begin with the syllables Pet or Pit, Tille, El, Roth, and the like.

I must also here remark, that even many words or names of

¹ *Infra*, Art. V.

² Append. n. 2.

³ Append. n. 3.

places which pass for old Scotish, Gaelic, or Irish, may have had the same signification in the British language which they have in Gaelic, and yet have been originally Pictish,—these three languages, the British, the Pictish, and the Irish, as hath been already remarked, having all originally been only different dialects of the same mother tongue, the Celtic; there being an analogy no less visible betwixt the two of these languages that still subsist—to wit, the British, divided into the Welch, Cornish, and Armorican dialects, and the Irish, the same with the old Scotish or Gaelic, on the one hand, than there is on the other betwixt the English, High and Low Dutch, originally dialects of the Gothish. Those who by education, or by their own private study, have a competent knowledge of these languages, will, by comparing them, find out their analogy; and others that have not had those advantages, will find abundance of proofs of it in the late Mr. Edward Lhuyd's learned work, entitled *Archæologia Britannica*.

It was in all appearance this analogy or affinity of the Pictish language with the Irish or Gaelic, the vulgar tongue of the generality of the Scots in those days, and with the British, which was the language of the Walenses or Welch in Galloway and other parts of the west of Scotland, that, upon the union of the Pictish and Scottish kingdoms in the ninth age, made the Pictish language so disappear before the middle of the twelfth age (which was Henry of Huntington's¹ wonder) as if it never had been; the Picts after the union, being by degrees all over the north incorporated into one body of people with the Scots, whose vulgar language, before Malcolm Keanmore's reign, was generally the Gaelic or Irish, left off more naturally the use of their own language, and came to speak that of the Scots, because of the affinity betwixt the two languages. The same thing happened in Galloway and the western parts, where many of the Picts were mixed with the Walenses, or remains of the Midland Britains, even before the union with the Scots, and where they made a greater figure after it by the name of Galwejenses, as we shall see elsewhere.

ART. V.—*Of the extent of the Pictish dominions.*

There is no part of the ancient state of the north of Britain or Scotland that seems to have been more misrepresented or less understood by our modern writers than the extent of the Pictish and Scottish dominions in old times. Boece² reduces the Pictish dominions within very small bounds, since he tells

¹ Hen. Huntington, lib. 1, fol. 171.

² Boet. pp. 11, 12, edit. A.D. 1575; Leslæi hist. p. 54.

us that from the beginning of the Scots' monarchy in Britain, the Scots, besides the western provinces and isles, were possessed of all the northern countries beyond the Grampian hills or Cairn of Mounth, and sets down the distribution of these northern parts, made by Fergus I. three centuries before the incarnation, among his nobles; and in this he is generally followed by the Scotish writers that came after him.

Camden,¹ on the contrary, confines the Scotish dominions even in St. Columba's time to Argyll, Kentyre, Knapdail, and some of the western islands towards Ireland, and extends the Pictish territories to Lorn, Mule, and Jona, or Ycolmkill, grounded chiefly on Bede's having made Jona the donation of the Picts to St. Columba. My intention here is to examine the extent of the Pictish or Caledonian dominions according to what remains we have of ancient writers. And, 1st, their extent to the north—that is, beyond the Friths of Clyde and Forth, towards the northern extremities of Scotland; 2d, the extent of their dominions, by degrees, to the south of these friths.

SEC. 1.—*Extent of the Caledonian or Pictish dominions to the north; that they reached to the extremities of the north of Scotland, or northern parts of Britain.*

Tacitus,² the most ancient author that gives us any account of the northern parts of Britain, includes in Caledonia all the countries on the north side of the Friths of Clyde and Forth. Dio,³ in his relation of Severus' expedition into Caledonia, gives us much the same notion of its extent.

Bede is no less express that the Picts, from their first settlement in Britain, possessed all the northern parts of it beyond the friths, not only towards the east, but even those parts towards the west which became afterwards, upon the Scots coming into Britain, their portion or possession. For he tells us⁴ that the Frith of Clyde was anciently the boundary of the Britains and Picts, and consequently he says that the Scots, at their first coming to Britain, received, or took possession of, a portion of the Pictish territories, *in parte Pictorum*, at the north side of the Frith of Clyde, which thenceforth became the boundary of the Scots and Britains, as before the Scots' coming in it had been the western boundary of the Britains and Picts,

¹ Camden in *Scotia*.

² Tacit. vit. *Agricola*, pp. 233, 234, edit. Lips.

³ Dio, p. 867.

⁴ ‘Est autem sinus maris permaximus, qui antiquitus gentem Britonum a Pictis secernebat; qui ab Occidente in terras longo spatio erumpit, ubi est civitas Britonum munissima usque hodie, quae vocatur Alcluith.’—Bede, lib. 1, c. 1. ‘Procedente tempore Britannia post Britones & Pictos tertiam Scotorum nationem in Pictorum parte recepit.’—*Ibid.*

whose territories towards the east had been bounded by the Frith of Forth.

The Picts, according to Ammian,¹ were divided in the fourth century into Deucaledonians and Vecturiones—that is, southern and northern, according to the interpretation of learned modern critics. But what is only guessed at from the etymology of the names by these critics is plainly expressed by Bede,² where he says the southern Picts, converted to Christianity by St. Ninian, were divided from the northern, whom St. Columba converted, by a high ridge of hills, which can be no other than the Grampians; so that the southern Picts were those that dwelt to the south of the Grampian hills, and the northern were those Picts who inhabited the countries from the same hills northwards to the extremities of Scotland.

That the Picts in St. Columba's time, that is, in the sixth century, were still in possession of the utmost extremities of the north of Britain, is further proved from the accounts that Adamnan gives us in St. Columba's life of the saint's journeys to these northern Picts, whom he converted. And here I cannot but observe, that as this life of St. Columba by Adamnan is, next to Gildas' writings, the most ancient historical piece remaining of a British writer, so, being received for genuine by the learned in foreign countries as well as at home, it contains the most ancient and authentic account of the Scotch history. But before I set down those passages of Adamnan containing St. Columba's journeys, in order to understand them more fully, and to set in a clearer light the extent of the Pictish dominions in those times,—to wit, in the sixth and seventh century,—it is necessary to give a distinct view of the names, situation, and several branches of that famous ridge of hills that reaches from one side of North Britain to the other.

These hills are called by Tacitus, and others after him, Mons Grampius, whence Granzebin; by Adamnan,³ Dorsum Britanniæ, commonly Drum-Albayn; by Bede,⁴ Ardua & horrentia montium juga; by an anonymous author of the description of Albany or Scotland, cited by Camden from a ms. in the Burghleyan Library, at present in the Colbertin, from whence it was copied, and is here inserted in the Appendix, No. 1, ‘Mons qui Mounth vocatur qui a mari occidentali usque ad orientale extenditur.’ And by another short description of Scotland in the Cotton⁵ Library of the thirteenth age they are thus explained: ‘Quod-dam vastum quod vocatur le Mounth ubi est pessimum pas-sagium sine cibo.’ This last passage respects particularly that branch of these hills commonly called the Cairn of Mounth.

¹ Ammian, Marcell. lib. 27.

² Adamn. vit. S. Columb. lib. 2, c. 46.

³ Bede, lib. 3, c. 4.

⁴ Bede, *supra*.

⁵ Nero, D. 11. 7.

As to their situation and branches, it is agreed on by all that the Grampian hills divide Scotland into two parts, they running from the east to the west. It is also agreed that the ridge of hills commonly called the Mounth, or Cairn of Mounth, that runs from Athole down the south side of the river of Dee to the east sea, near Dunnottar, is a chief branch of the Grampians; and generally the modern descriptions of Scotland bring the other branch of the Grampian hills, which terminates at the western sea, from Athole down through Braid-Albayn, by Loch Lomond to the Frith of Clyde; thus Boece, Buchanan, etc. Nor is there any dispute about it; but then it must be owned by all that have travelled through and considered the north-western parts of Scotland, that there is nowhere a more visible tract of the highest hills than from Athole through the mountainous parts of Badenoch towards the sea-coast of Knoydeart; so that besides the western ridge of hills before-mentioned, running from Athole through Braid-Albayn, and terminating at the Frith of Clyde, near Dunbarton, in the west, we must take notice of another branch of the Grampian hills extending from those of Athole through Badenoch to the sea-coast of Knoydeart, or Aresaick, in the north-west. And this last branch of Drum-Albayn, or the Grampian hills, seems plainly described by Adamnan.

He informs us that St. Columba's journeys from Ycolmkill, going to and returning from the habitation of Brude, king of the Picts, was by Loch Ness, which he calls in St. Columba's life *Nesæ Fluvius*,¹ and in the following chapter *Nesæ Lacus*; whence it appears that, besides the ordinary abode of the Pictish kings, which our historians fix at Abernethy, near Tay, King Brude must have had another residence (which Adamnan calls there *Domus regia*, and elsewhere *Munitio regis Brudei*)² at the northmost end of Loch Ness. And since surely he would not have a dwelling but among his subjects, it follows that his dominions included the most northern parts of Scotland,—it is probable they extended even over the Orknays, since we find in the same author St. Columba at King Brude's court,³ entreating that king to command the prince (*Regulus*) of the Orknays (who was also present at King Brude's court, and had given hostages to the king as a pledge of his fidelity) to command him, I say, to be favourable to St. Columba's monks then in Orkney.

Adamnan in the same place tells us that King Brude's dwelling, where St. Columba met with the Prince of Orkney, was in regard of Ycolmkill (*trans dorsum Britanniae*) on the other side

¹ Adamnan, vit. St. Columbæ, lib. 2, cap. 33.
³ Ibid. lib. 2, c. 42.

² Ibid. lib. 3, c. 35.

of Drum-Albayn ; and since, as we have seen, it was to the north of Lochness, it would appear that there must have been a branch of Drum-Albayn, or the Grampian, betwixt Ycolmkill and Lochness, which could not be any part of these hills as our modern writers describe them, but must have been a branch of them running from Athole to the north-western coast, such as we have described above ; and this is yet further confirmed by another passage of the same Adamnan,¹ where he says that Drum - Albayn divided the Scots from the Picts (*inter quos [Pictos & Scotos] dorsi montis Britannici disterni*). So that as that branch of the Grampians that goes from Athole to Clyde divided the Scots from the Britains and southern Picts, there must have been a second branch of it from Athole towards the north-western coast of Knoydeart or Aresaick, to separate the Scots from the northern Picts. The third branch of these hills, so well known by the name of Cairn of Mounth, was those high hills that, according to Bede, divided the southern Picts, converted by St. Ninian, from the northern, who received the faith from St. Columba. But as to this matter I only offer my conjectures from the passages of Adamnan, leaving the determination to the learned among our countrymen, who can more easily take a view of the places.

Meantime, supposing this situation and extent of the Grampian hills, it seems now no hard matter to determine the bounds of the Pictish and Scotish dominions during St. Columba's time, much different from the description that modern writers have given of them, since the Scotish kingdom, according to this description of the Grampians, must have been separated from the Pictish to the north by the branch of these hills that run from Athole towards Knoydeart or Aresaick, and to the south-east by another branch of the same hills running from Athole through Braid-Albayn by Loch Lomond towards the mouth of Clyde. Whence it follows that the kingdom of the Scots in Britain, called sometimes *Regnum Dalrietæ* or *Dalriedæ*,² included in those times all the western islands, together with the countries of Lorn, Argyle, Knapdayl, Cowell, Kentyre, Lochabyr, and a part of Braid-Albayn, etc.; and that the Pictish kingdom included all the rest of the north of Scotland, from the friths to the Orknays. But the marches of these two people were very variable, they being always ready to encroach one upon another, as they were more or less powerful. Thus Bede³ informs us ‘that upon the death of Egfrid, king of Northumberland, slain in battle by the Picts, A.D. 685, the Picts recovered a part of their dominions, which the Scots, as well as the Saxons, had seized upon.’

¹ Lib. 2, c. 46.

² Append. of pieces, n. 3.

³ Bede, lib. 4, c. 26.

However, from this account that Adamnan gives us of the bounds of the Scotish and Pictish dominions in St. Columba's time, it follows that since the island Jona was, as it were, in the heart or centre of the kingdom of Scots, composed of the islands and mainland as above, and separated from the Pictish dominions by sea and land, it could not have been the Picts, as Bede relates, but must needs have been the Scots, that gave it to St. Columba and his disciples; which is further evident from this, that Adamnan (who was Abbot of Ycolmkill, and on the place, and wrote earlier than Bede) never speaks of the Pictish country but as a country quite distinct from that where St. Columba dwelt in Ycolmkill. These are his words: 'Whilst the holy man St. Columba made some stay in the country of the Picts,' etc. Again: 'Whilst the holy man stayed some months in the Pictish provinces, he was obliged to pass over the water of Ness or Lochness.'¹ He hath much the same expressions, cap. 32 and elsewhere, and always supposes the country of the Picts a strange country, where St. Columba used to travel and remain only as his mission called him; whereas, if Jona had belonged to the Picts, he would never have mentioned their country as a distinct dominion where he was from home, as he nowhere mentions the country of the Scots in Britain as a strange country in regard of his monastery in Jona. On the contrary, we find the island of Jona always mentioned by Adamnan as being in the kingdom of the Scots in Britain, and the inhabitants of it as subjects of the king of the Scots. There it was that St. Columba² inaugurated Aydan king of the Scots; there St. Columba with his monks pray for victory to King Aydan as their sovereign;³ there King Aydan consults the saint which of his sons was to live to be his successor.⁴ In fine, the northern Picts were not Christians when St. Columba came first to Britain; and their king, Brude,⁵ being as yet a pagan, shut his gates against the saint when he first went to visit him, so far were the Picts at his coming from giving him possessions; whereas the Scots, being Christians long before, received him with all respect, and gave him a place of abode; and accordingly, at his first landing in Britain,⁶ he applied to Conal, king of the Scots, by whom there is no doubt but the monastery of Jona was founded; and in effect the most authentic⁷ annals that the Irish have, such as those of Tigernac and of Ulster, mention expressly that the island of Hy or Jona was given to St. Columba by this King Conal, son of Congall; and there is no reason to distrust these annals in a matter of

¹ Adamnan, *vita St. Columbae*, lib. 2, c. 11.

² Lib. 3, c. 5.

³ Lib. 1, c. 8.

⁴ Lib. 1, c. 9.

⁶ Lib. 1, c. 7.

⁷ Usher, *Antiq.* p. 367.

⁵ Lib. 2, c. 35.

this kind. As to Bede's¹ ascribing to the Picts the donation of Jona to St. Columba, he being a stranger and living at a distance from these parts, and having had his accounts of Ycolmkill only by hearsay, his authority on this subject ought not to be put in the balance with that of Adamnan, who was himself Abbot of Ycolmkill, near St. Columba's time, and one of his successors, and besides, had his information from those who lived with the saint, and from the originals in the monastery itself; and all that can be said to apologize for Bede is, that supposing, as he does in the beginning of his history, that all those western countries and isles belonged originally to the Picts, from whom the Scots had them by favour or force at their first entry into Britain, and seeing St. Columba was chiefly destined to preach the gospel to the Picts, he supposed naturally that the Picts had in gratitude made the donation of Jona to him and his disciples.

But to return now and conclude what we find in aftertimes of the extent of the Pictish dominions towards the north. It appears by contemporary authors that the Picts continued in possession of the northern provinces of Scotland till their union in one kingdom with the Scots in the ninth century. 1st. Nennius,² however uncertain his authority may be as to ancient transactions, may be surely depended on in the account he gives of the inhabitants of the island in his own time. He wrote A.D. 832, as his chronicle shows, that is, a very few years before the union of the Scots and Picts, which probably he lived to see. This author, speaking of the first settlement of the Picts in Britain, says they seized first the Orkney Islands, and thence possessed themselves of many countries to the left side of Britain, that is to say, of the north (as he explains himself, cap. 10, *Picti de Aquilone*), and possess them to this day. And elsewhere the same Nennius, speaking of the Orkney Islands, says they are beyond the Picts. Now, if the Picts had possessed only the countries to the south of the Grampian, and the Scots those to the north, he would have said the Orknays were beyond the Scots, and not, as he does, beyond the Picts.

The second proof of the Picts being in possession of all the north till their union with the Scots may be taken from the life of St. Findan, who lived in the ninth age, written by an author of the time, and companion of the saint, and printed by

¹ Bede, lib. 3, c. 4.

² Nennius, Hist. Briton. c. 5, p. 99, edit. Gal.: 'Picti venerunt & occupaverunt insulas quæ Orcades vocantur, & postea ex insulis finitimis vastaverunt, non modicas & multas regiones in sinistrali plaga Britanniae, & manent usque in hodiernum diem.'

'Tertia insula sita est in extremo limite orbis Britanniae ultra Pictos, & vocatur Orcania ins.'—Nennius, c. 2, p. 98.

Goldastus,¹ as an authentic monument. This author relates that St. Findan was led away captive out of Ireland by the Normans or Danes, about the end of the eighth century; and that in going from Ireland to Denmark they came to certain islands called the Orknays, in the neighbourhood of the Pictish nation, ‘ad quasdam venere insulas, juxta Pictorum gentem, quas Orcades vocant.’ It is to be remarked that the author, who was a companion of St. Findan, observes this happened about the end of the eighth century, that is, about fifty years before the union of the Picts and Scots; by which it appears plainly that the Picts remained in possession of the utmost extremities of the north of Scotland as long as their monarchy lasted in their own name.

SEC. 2.—*Extent of the Pictish dominions towards the south, on this side of the Friths of Clyde and Forth.*

To set in a clearer light what we have to say of the extent of the Pictish dominions on the south side of the friths in the debateable lands, we shall consider the state of the Picts in three different epochs,—1st. From the first mention we meet with in history of the Caledonians or Picts, till the coming in of the Saxons; 2d. From thence till the death of Egfrid, king of Northumberland, killed in battle by the Picts, A.D. 685; 3d. From Egfrid’s death till the union of the Picts and Scots in one monarchy, under Keneth the Great.

As to the state of the Caledonians or Picts in the first epoch, the Roman writers Tacitus and Dio, as we have already shown, limit in the most ancient times the bounds of Caledonia to the south at the Friths of Clyde and Forth. Bede² also makes these friths the boundary of the Picts to the south, at their first settlement in Britain, and even long afterwards;³ but that did not hinder this warlike people, still in motion, and ready to catch at all opportunities of extending their dominion over the Midland Britains in the debateable lands betwixt the walls, to make frequent settlements there; and though often beat out of them by the Romans, to return still with new vigour (as we may have occasion to show in the second part of this essay), till at last, about the year 426, after the Romans’ last farewell to Britain, the Picts took peaceable possession of all these midland provinces up to the Northumbrian wall,⁴ at least towards the eastern coast, obliging the remains of the provincial Britains of these parts to be either subject to them or retire,

¹ Allemanicarum rerum scriptores vetusti ex bibliotheca Goldasti, A.D. 1606, edit. vita S. Findani, p. 318.

² Bede, lib. 1, cc. 1 and 12.

³ Idem. lib. 4, c. 26.

⁴ Gildas, c. 12.

partly to the South Britains, partly towards the western coasts about Galloway, Clydesdale, and Dunbritton; and thus the bounds of the Picts towards the south remained till the coming in of the Saxons, about the year 449.

Epoch 2. It would at first seem that the Saxons, in the beginning, did not molest the Picts in the possession of the midland provinces, since, after the first battles which the Saxons fought with advantage against the Picts and Scots in defence of the Britains, the Saxons soon made peace with the Picts, in order to turn their arms against the Britains themselves; but Bede¹ remarks that this peace was not made with the Picts till the Saxons had first driven them away at a distance, and apparently possessed themselves of a part of what the Picts had conquered from the Britains; and (if we may trust to Nennius' relation) the Saxons forced back the Picts to the friths, and made themselves masters of the most part of the midland country. For Nennius² tells us, that besides the other supplies that came to the Saxons, Hengistus their leader, under pretence of fighting against the Scots, called in forty vessels (*Chiūlae*) laden with Saxons, under the command of Ochta and Abisa, who, after having sailed about the Picts, and ravaged the Orknays, came and took possession of many countries on the south side of the friths [*trans mare Fresicum*], that is, betwixt the Britains and the Scots, to the confines of the Picts. Whatever truth there be in this narration of Nennius, English writers pretend that the Saxons got, by degrees, such a footing in these midland provinces, that they made some of them in after ages a part of the kingdom of Bernicia, which, as they say, extended from the river Theyss towards the Scotish sea or frith. This kingdom was set up in A.D. 547, by Ida. But to leave the discussion of this matter to its proper place, in the meantime it does not appear that the Picts of these parts were expelled, but still remained uneasy under the Saxons' usurpation, ready on all opportunities to recover their possessions, as appeared when, A.D. 670, the king of the Picts, with a great army, intending to recover his territories on the south of the Forth, invaded King Egfrid, but was defeated by the Saxons with a great slaughter of the Picts; so that the Picts dwelling in the midland provinces remained under subjection till A.D. 685, that Egfrid³ himself, having

¹ ‘Inito ad tempus foedere cum Pictis quos bello longius pepulerant, in Sociosarma vertere incipiunt.’—*Bede*, l. c. 15.

² ‘[Hengistus] invitavit Ochta & Abisa cum 40 Chiulis. At ipsi cum navigarent circa Pictos, vastaverunt Orchades ins. veneruntque & occupaverunt plurimas regiones trans mare Fresicum, i.e. quod inter nos Scotosque est, usque ad confinia Pictorum.’—*Nennius*, c. 37, p. 107.

³ *Bede*, lib. 4, c. 26.

invaded the Pictish territories, was killed in battle, with the greatest part of his army, by the Picts under the conduct of their King Brude,¹ son of Derili; and here ends the second epoch of the Pictish settlement to the south of the friths.

Epoch 3. After the death of Egfrid, as the appendix to Nennius tells us, not only the Saxons never attempted any more to exact tribute of the Picts dwelling in the midland countries; but, as Bede² remarks, from that time the courage and vigour of the Saxons still decayed, so that the Picts recovered their ancient territories to the south of the friths, and reduced the kingdom of Alfrid,³ successor to Egfrid, into narrower bounds. The Picts having thus got footing again on this side of the friths, took advantage of the Saxons' weakness and divisions, and daily made new progress in recovering their southern territories betwixt the walls. So we see, A.D. 710, they were advanced as far as Hefeld or Carehouse, near the Northumbrian wall, where they gave battle to the Saxons.

During the rest of this eighth century, we find the kings of the Picts frequently on the south side of the friths, in war either against the Northumbrian kings, or joined with them against the Britains that dwelt in those parts; and so powerful were they, that, A.D. 773, Aleredus,⁴ king of Northumberland, fled to the king of the Picts for refuge; and, A.D. 794, Osbald, another of the Northumbrian kings, took the same shelter. About the end of this age and the beginning of the next, the Picts possessed themselves of Galloway; and we find⁵ that at the time of the union with the Scots, the Picts were in possession of all the midland territories from Twede to the Scotish sea or friths, all which King Keneth possessed himself of, as well in the right of the Picts, to whose crown he succeeded, as by that of conquest. And thus having united the Pictish kingdom, from Orknay to Twede and Galloway, to that of the Scots, he was the first monarch of all Scotland or Albany; but of this elsewhere, and this may suffice at present as to the extent of the Pictish kingdom, both to the north and south.

ART. VI.—*Of the nature or form of the Pictish Government.*

As to the form of the Pictish government, the series that we have of their kings, and frequent mention of them in ancient history, prove it was monarchical. But whether in the most ancient times, and from the first settlement of the Caledonians

¹ Append. Nennii, p. 116.

² Bede, lib. 4, c. 26.

³ Malmesbur. f. 10, n. 38.

⁴ Scriptor. Ang., col. 107, n. 34, and col. 113, n. 54.

⁵ Polychron. pp. 194, 199, 204, 207, 210.

or Picts in Britain, they were always governed by kings, cannot, at so great a distance of time, and in such want of ancient monuments, be otherwise determined than by probable conjectures from the common customs of other nations, and of those of Britain in particular, in those early times.

In general, the beginning of all governments is from a kind of monarchy; nor can it well be otherwise, it being impossible to contain a rude multitude, such as all nations were in their origin, by common council, or keep them united in one body or state otherwise than by the awe of a leader or commander; nor are the republican schemes fitted but to a people already in some measure polished by a monarchical government.¹ And, indeed, the beginnings of all governments that we meet with in history,² even those who afterwards became famous commonwealths, were from one common leader or governor, who, being either more aged and experienced, or stronger, or wiser, or by some other course of divine providence, first overawed the multitude, or got the ascendant over them, so as to gain their confidence, their respect, and their obedience to his commands and laws. Accordingly, the most ancient accounts we have from the best writers inform us that in the earliest times all Britain was governed by little kings.³

So that, on the whole, there seems no doubt but that the government of the Picts or Caledonians was monarchical from the beginning; but whether their country, Caledonia, in the first times, was divided into little states, whereof each had its king, or whether all under one common commander, can be only guessed at, and so it were useless to inquire into it, having no monuments of those times. Fordun⁴ tells us, that whereas the series of their kings began at Cruythne, the son of Kynne, before his time the Picts were governed by judges; and though even that would be an ancient origin of their monarchy, since it reaches some ages before the incarnation, yet the notion of judges seeming new and foreign, it is likely it was only invented to give a preference in antiquity to the Scotish monarchy over that of the Picts, it being otherwise generally owned, even by the Scotish historians that claim the highest antiquity to the Scots, that their settlement in Britain was posterior to that of the Picts; and it is very probable that those first rulers of the Picts (supposing there had been any such), under the title of judges, wanted only the name, but had the authority of kings.

Tacitus,⁵ in his account of the Britains in general, in-

¹ Tit. Liv. lib. 2, n. 4, 5, 6.

² Justin. hist.

³ Diodor. Sicul. lib. 6, c. 7; Strab. lib. 4, p. 200; Pomp. Mela, lib. 3, c. 6.

⁴ Lib. 1, c. 36.

⁵ '[Brit.] olim regibus parebant, nunc per principes factionibus & studiis trahuntur.'—*Tacit. vit. Agric.* p. 231, edit. Lips.

forms us that they were wont in former times to have kings, but that in Agricola's time they were much divided in factions by their princes, scarce two or three cantons being under one government or common council; but this determines nothing as to Caledonia, and at most might have been but a casual anarchy, founded upon rebellion or sedition; and Tacitus, though he does not give to Galgacus, leader of the Caledonians, the name of king, yet he in some manner describes him as such, since he tells us that, among all the commanders of the Caledonians, Galgacus was the chief, not only in valour, but in birth and nobility;¹ and it is probable the necessity the Caledonians were under in following times to oppose the Roman encroachments, would contribute to heal their intestine dissensions, and restore monarchical government, in case it had met with any interruption. In the rest of the Roman wars against the Caledonians or Picts, the Romans seem very little informed of their government, being scarce ever accustomed to treat with them but as enemies to the empire, whom they endeavoured to keep at as great a distance as they could; so it is no wonder that we have from them no account of the kings of the Picts, which we might have expected had any of them been taken by the Romans, as was Caractacus, king of the Silures, under Claudius.

ART. VII.—*Of the antiquity of the Pictish Monarchy, and
of the number and series of their Kings.*

Notwithstanding the disasters that happened to the ancient and once famous nation of the Caledonians or Picts, by which not only the records and monuments of their history were destroyed, but the people themselves so far eclipsed as to give occasion to later writers to allege that they were all cut off, yet there still remains sufficient proofs of their surviving the ninth age, and still subsisting both as to the royal succession and as to the people themselves, though no more for these several past ages known by their own proper name, but by the common name of Scots, with whom they were incorporated. This we shall have occasion to show afterwards; at present my intention is to prove that the Picts laid claim to as ancient a monarchy and high succession of kings, and with as great probability, as either of their neighbours, the Britains of the south or the Irish, and this with the allowance of these last.

For those Irish authors who assert the antiquity of their own country and monarchy in the Milesian line, maintain also that of the Pictish; the one and the other being equally attested, as

¹ ‘Virtute & genere præstans.’—*Tacit. ib. fol. 234.*

they assure us,¹ by all those ancient books on which the credit of their own remote antiquities is chiefly grounded, such as *Psaltair Cashell*, *Leabhair-Dromnasnaeta*, *Lcean*, etc., all which agree, according to the most learned of their modern writers, that the Pictish monarchy in North Britain began at the time of their King Herimon, son to Milesius, whom they place in the eleventh or twelfth, and some of them in the thirteenth, century before the birth of Christ, and that the Picts had seventy kings of their own nation, from Cathluan (so the Irish call the first king of the Picts) to Constantine, who reigned about the end of the eighth age, about whose time it is probable the Irish received this account of the Pictish monarchy whilst it subsisted as yet in splendour. The same account of the Picts is given by the book of Lecan² (so famous among the Irish) in these words, as Flaherty relates them : ‘ Gud & filius Cathluanus duces Pictorum in Hyberniam ad Inverslainge in Hykensalia : Crimthano Rege Lageniae, & Herimone super Hyberniam regnante. Cathluanus ille primus septuaginta regum Albaniae ad Constantinum usque.’

Though the modern Irish writers have frequently mentioned this number of seventy Pictish kings to the reign of Constantine, yet none of them have thought fit hitherto to give us the names and series of these kings; only Lynch³ sets down the names and succession of the Pictish kings from Brude, son of Meilochon, that is, from the year 556 and downwards, till Brede or Brude, their last king, with the years of their reigns; and Lynch tells us that he had this catalogue from an Irish copy of Nennius, the British historian.

Now, however uncertain may be the testimony of these Irish books or other monuments in what they relate of their own remote antiquity (into which we shall hereafter have occasion to inquire), it is generally affirmed by the best writers of that nation,⁴ that the *Psaltair Cashell* is the work of Cormac Culenan, who died in the beginning of the tenth century; and Keating⁵ assures us that this account of the seventy Pictish kings and of their monarchies, beginning in Herimon’s time, is taken from an Irish poem inserted in *Psaltair Cashell*, and by consequence written before it. The *Book of Conquests*, *Lebhargabhala*, which, according to Flaherty,⁶ gives the same account of the Picts, though, to be sure, it is not more ancient than St. Patrick (as a late Irish writer affirms⁷), yet it may be allowed to have been

¹ Keating, pp. 120, 121, 122, etc.; Colgan, not. in vit. S. Patric. Ward. vit. S. Rumoldi, p. 371; Flaherty, Ogyg. p. 190.

² Lecan, f. 287, apud Flaherty, Ogyg. Domestica, p. 190.

³ Lynch, Cambren. Eversus, p. 93. ⁴ Waræus de scriptorib. Hybern. p. 47.

⁵ Keating, p. 123.

⁶ Ogyg. p. 188.

⁷ D. Ken. pref. 25, 26.

written about the ninth age, and whilst the Pictish monarchy was as yet subsisting ; whence it follows that, since the Irish could have no private motive of their own to invent this story of the antiquity of the Pictish settlement and monarchy, and thus to put a foreign people on a level with themselves in the two qualities upon which they chiefly valued themselves,—that is, the antiquity of their settlement and that of their monarchy,—it follows, I say, from this, that the Irish writers must have had good information, and that in all appearance from the Picts themselves, still subsisting in a separate, distinct monarchy, under their own kings, when at least the most ancient of these Irish pieces was written. So, upon the whole, these testimonies of the Irish writers sufficiently prove that the Picts claimed as ancient a settlement and monarchy in Britain as the Irish do in Ireland, and that on so good grounds that the Irish antiquaries, so jealous of those prerogatives, were equally persuaded of it.

But, for a further proof that what is advanced by the Irish antiquaries of the antiquity of the monarchy and number of the Pictish kings in Britain was no invention of the Irish bards, but the Picts' own opinion of themselves, there is still extant an abstract of an ancient chronicle of the Picts, under this title, *Chronica de Origine Antiquorum Pictorum*, which agrees entirely with the account that the Irish give of them, both as to the number of seventy kings before Constantine, and as to the antiquity of the Pictish monarchy in Britain, and differs only in one name ; that whereas this chronicle, and all the Scottish writers, call the first king of the Picts Cruithne, the Irish call him Cathluan, which may be only two names for the same person—as the patriarch of the Irish, Milesius, was otherwise called Gallamb or Gollamb.

In this ancient piece or chronicle of the Picts, after a preface taken for the most part from Isidore of Sevile's *Book of Origines*, there is a series or succession of the Pictish kings, containing seventy kings to Constantine, with the years of their reigns, which all summed up amount at least to ten or eleven centuries before the incarnation, which is the date the Irish commonly give to the beginning of Herimon, their first king of Ireland, during whose reign they assure us that the monarchy of the Picts in Britain was founded.

This *Chronica de Origine Antiquorum Pictorum* bears that title in great red letters in the ms. in which I found it. This ms. belonged formerly to Secretary Cecil, Lord Burghley, afterwards Lord High Treasurer of England, and his name is upon it, written with his own hand. It was in his possession when Camden perused it, and extracted several passages from it, to

be seen in the later editions which he published of his *Britannia*, in the description of Scotland. Cecil's library being afterwards put to sale, this ms.¹, with several others, was bought up by order of Mr. Colbert, Minister of State to the late king of France, who employed in making his rich collection of MSS., consisting of above eight thousand volumes, the famous M. Baluze, by whose means I came to the knowledge of this ms., and some other ancient pieces relating to Scotland. The title of *Chronica*, which this short piece bears, was commonly given by writers of after ages to pieces, however short, that contained any series of facts, with their dates or catalogues of kings, with the years of their reigns. This ms. seems to be written above four hundred years ago, and contains some other pieces relating to Scotland, which will be found with this in the appendix to this essay. I am lately informed that this whole ms. library of Mr. Colbert is bought up by the king of France to be added to the royal library.

We have also catalogues of the Pictish kings from the Scotish writers. The accounts they give us of the names, number, and years of these kings, may be all reduced to two principal sources whence they are derived. The first is the old register of St. Andrews, which certainly, if we had it correct, would be preferable to any other account given by the Scots; by reason that the church of St. Andrew, being founded by the Picts, would probably be more careful than any other to preserve their memory, so far as it did not seem to lessen or interfere with the honour of the Scots, according to the way of thinking or prejudice of those times, by which it was thought a derogation from the honour of the Scots to grant the Picts a priority or preference in an ancient settlement or monarchy in Britain to themselves. From this register or other monuments of St. Andrews are, no doubt, derived the imperfect account of the Pictish kings given by Winton, canon of St. Andrews and prior of Lochlevin, and the catalogue set down by James Gray, of which elsewhere. The anonymous author of the history of the Picts, printed by Freebairn, A.D. 1706, hath given also a catalogue of the Pictish kings, but most incorrect and disfigured, taken, he says, from two ancient records of St. Andrews and Lochlevin, which, notwithstanding the contempt with which that author speaks of them, would have been probably of greater use to the Pictish history, if given correctly, than all his performance, grounded chiefly on H. Boece's history. This series of the Pictish kings, from the register of St. Andrews, in the copy of it sent me some years ago by Sir Robert Sybbald, M.D., reckons only fifty-two Pictish kings, from Cruytlne till

¹ Cod. 3120, Biblioth. ms. Colbertin, Paris.

Constantine, that is, eighteen kings less than the abstract of the Pictish chronicle and the Irish antiquaries; and it brings down the first settlement of the Picts in Britain to put it on a level, or rather place it an age or two later than that of the Scots. The other source of the catalogues of the Pictish kings is Fordun, followed by later Scotish writers; he reckons six kings more than the register of St. Andrews, in all fifty-eight from Cruythne to Constantine, there being added here and there some names that are neither in that register nor in the Pictish chronicle; and among others, Hurgust, the son of Fergus or Forgso, in the fourth age, to make the catalogue agree with Fordun's own chronicle, which places the coming in of Regulus to North Britain, with the relics of St. Andrew, under King Hurgust, during the reign of the Emperor Constantius, for no other reason that I can guess at, but because in this emperor's time the relics of St. Andrew and St. Luke were, in the year of our Lord 357, removed to Constantinople; whereas it is more likely, as it will appear when we come to treat of it, that the coming in of St. Andrew's relics to Scotland, or rather to Pictland, and the foundation of Kilrimunt or St. Andrews, were of a much later date than Fordun places them.

Now, as to the use of all these different catalogues towards regulating the chronology of the Pictish kings; in the first place, a great difference ought to be made betwixt what these catalogues contain before, and what they set down after, the times that Christianity was preached among the Picts of the south by St. Ninian, towards the beginning of the fifth age, and among the northern Picts by St. Columba, about the middle of the sixth age. As to the times preceding their Christianity, though their living in the neighbourhood of the Romans and provincial Britains (since these embraced the gospel), either by conversation or by Christian captives, which they frequently carried off in their inroads into the Roman provinces, might have introduced among the Caledonians or Picts some use of letters earlier than among others at a greater distance from the seat of learning; yet, having no assurance that this was common among the Picts before the nation was converted to Christianity, and there being no certain means to preserve historical facts or dates for any considerable length of time, and beyond the memory of men, without the use of letters, we do not pretend to give that part of the chronicle of the Picts that passed before the gospel was preached to them as proper materials to build on it historical facts or chronological dates; but we give it only as an ancient monument of history, containing the tradition of that once famous people, concerning the antiquity of their settlement and monarchy in Britain, before

whom there is no memory of any known inhabitants of the north of Britain, nor any certain epoch of their beginning or settlement there; but reaching up into the dark ages of the depth of antiquity, they may, for what any can show to the contrary, contend in the antiquity of settlement and monarchical government with any nation in Europe. And even as to the number of their seventy kings, I do not see but that might have been preserved by tradition without the use of letters.

As to the succession of the Pictish kings and their chronology, since their first conversion to Christianity, about the beginning of the fifth age and downwards, two reasons, in my opinion, render the accounts given of them by this abstract of the Pictish chronicle preferable by far to those of the Scots, either in the register of St. Andrews, or in Fordun, and their followers,—1st, Because, as I have already observed, the abstract seems plainly to have been taken from the chronicles of the Picts themselves, written whilst their monarchy and nation subsisted as yet by itself, and under their own name in Britain, so it is more ancient than any accounts that the Scotish writers give of them, and nearer the times; 2d, Because the accounts given of the Pictish kings and their chronology in this abstract, in the times posterior to their receiving Christianity, with the use of letters, agree much better than those given by the Scots, with all that is recorded of the Picts in other ancient British writers that mention them.

For the most certain era by which all the chronology of the Pictish kings is to be regulated depends upon¹ Bede's assuring us that the year 565 of Christ concurred with the ninth year of the reign of Brude, son of Meilochon, king of the Picts, who was converted to Christianity by St. Columba; from thence follows that King Brude began his reign A.D. 556. This being supposed as a fixed era, to which all agree, and reckoning from this the years of each king of the Picts as they are set down in the several catalogues, it will be easy to find out which of these catalogues or accounts of the succession of the Pictish kings are the most exact, by their conformity to other ancient writers of Britain in the ages following, where we have the surest accounts of the Picts.

And, first, it is agreed on by all writers after Bede,² that Egfrid, king of Northumberland, was killed in battle by the Picts, A.D. 685; and it appears by the appendix to Nennius³ that it was by Brude, king of the Picts, who commanded them in this battle, that King Egfrid was killed. Now this agrees exactly

¹ Bede, lib. 3, c. 4.

² Idem, lib. 4, c. 26.

³ Quindecim Scriptores, edit. Gal. Append. Nenn. p. 126.

with the chronology of the abstract of the Pictish chronicle, according to which the reign of Brude, son of Bily, king of the Picts, began A.D. 675, and ended 696, so this battle fell out during his reign ; whereas, according to the chronology of the catalogue of Fordun (which gives only eleven years to the reign of this Brude, son of Bily, whilst both the register of St. Andrews as well as the chronicle of the Picts assign twenty-one years to his reign),—according, I say, to Fordun's chronology, Brude, son of Bily, ended his reign A.D. 660, about twenty-five years before this battle.

2d. Ceolfrid, abbot of Wiremouth,¹ wrote his famous letter about Easter and the tonsure to Naitan, king of the Picts, A.D. 715. And this agrees perfectly with the chronology of the foresaid abstract of the Pictish chronicle, according to which Naitan or Nectan, son of Derili, king of the Picts, reigned from A.D. 711 till A.D. 726 ; whereas, according to Fordun's catalogue, Naitan ended his reign A.D. 703 ; and according to the copy of the register of St. Andrews, such as it was sent to me, this King Naitan did not begin his reign till A.D. 747. So they must be both wrong, and the abstract alone exact.

3d. The death of Onnust or Oengus, son of Hurgus or Fergus, king of the Picts, is fixed to the year 761, by a short chronicle at the end of some editions of Bede,² by Roger Houeden,³ and by Simeon of Durham ;⁴ now this agrees entirely with the supputation of the Pictish chronicle, according to which the death of this Onnust or Oengus happened just that year 761. Whereas, according to the chronolgy of Fordun's catalogue, it would have happened A.D. 737, about twenty-four years before its true date ; and according to the account of the catalogue of St. Andrews, such as I have it, it would have happened about forty years after its true epoch,—I say, such as I have it, for I doubt not but there are many errors and false readings in the transcript of it that was sent me, particularly in the numbers.

4th. Kinoth or Cineoch, king of the Picts, gave a retreat in his kingdom to Alcred, king of Northumberland, expelled out of his kingdom A.D. 774, according to Roger Houeden and Simeon Durham's chronicles ;⁵ and yet not only there is no account of this action honourable to the Picts in our Scotish writers, but not so much as the name of this Kinoth in either of our Scotish catalogues of the Pictish kings ; but he is to be found in his own rank in the abstract of the Pictish chronicle, as well as in that given us by Lynch from an appendix to Nennius. And this King Kinoth's death, according to the chronology of that Pictish

¹ Bede, lib. 5, c. 22.

² *Coloniae in 180, A.D. 1609.*

³ Scriptor. fol. 231, n. 40.

⁴ Scriptor. fol. 105, n. 50.

⁵ R. Houeden & Simeon Dunelm, *chron. ad A.D. 774.*

chronicle, falls just in with the year 775, which perfectly agrees with the chronicles of Houeden and Simeon Dunelm; but our two Scotish catalogues, as I said, have not one word of this King Kinoth.

The authority of these English chronicles had that weight with Langhorn,¹ in his chronicle of the Pictish kings, that he abandons here entirely Fordun's catalogue, which was his only guide, to follow those English writers nearer the times. And the reader may observe elsewhere in him,² that he is at last obliged to give over entirely these catalogues, not being able to reconcile them to the era of the end of the Pictish monarchy and its union with that of the Scots, about or before the year 850; and, having no other guide, he is forced to follow his own conjectures; whereas this famous era agrees perfectly with the Pictish ancient chronicle, and Lynch's copy from Nennius, as may be proved elsewhere.

Meantime, what we have shown of the agreement of this short chronicle of the Pictish kings with all the best monuments of British history that mention the Picts in those times, is a new confirmation of its being an abstract of the true Pictish chronicles, done by their own writers, whilst their monarchy was as yet subsisting under their own name; and, by consequence having been writ nearer the times of the transactions, it is more to be depended on for the chronology of the Pictish kings than any catalogue that hath as yet appeared.

But, as it hath been said, this ought to be understood only of the latter part of this chronicle, to wit, the succession of their kings since their conversion to Christianity, in the fifth and sixth ages. For as to the first part of this chronicle, containing the succession of the Pictish kings before the incarnation, and even what passed after the incarnation, down till the reign of Durst, son of Irb, in the beginning of the fifth age,—that first part, I say, cannot be looked upon as a sufficient ground of history. 1st. Because we have no assurance that the Picts had the use of letters among them before their conversion to Christianity; and what certainty can be expected of dates and particular facts past the memory of men, without the use of letters? So all that we can rely upon in the first part of that abstract is the number of seventy kings before Constantine, as we remarked already, and at most their names, but not the dates or years of their reigns.

Because, in the second place, the incredible length of reigns ascribed in the first part of that abstract to some of these ancient Pictish kings, seems to render that part of it, in the condition that we have it, very improper to become the founda-

¹ Langhorn, *Antiquit. Albionen.* p. 300.

² Idem, p. 301, etc.

tion of any certain chronology or history. So that when I come to treat of the history of the northern parts of Britain or Scotland in a chronological order, having unquestionable vouchers in the Roman writers of what remains there are of the Caledonian or Pictish history before the fifth age, I shall begin the chronological succession of the Pictish kings no earlier, at most, than about the reign of Durst, son of Erb or Irb, that is, from about the beginning of the fifth age and downwards to the conversion of Brude, son of Meilochon or Melcothon, A.D. 565; from whence, as from a fixed era, down to the end of the Pictish monarchy, or its union with that of the Scots, we have in this abstract an exact succession of these kings, confirmed by and conformable, as we have shown, to the best accounts that we have of them from the English writers.

But that the reader may judge by himself of this whole matter, I shall, 1st, in the appendix to this essay, give this abstract of the Pictish chronicles whole and entire, such as I found it in the ms. already mentioned, without any addition or alteration, together with some other ancient pieces, being persuaded that nothing hath been more hurtful to the truth of our history than the smothering by contempt or neglect ancient pieces relating to it, because either their barbarous Latin style did not please the taste of our modern writers, or that the discoverers, finding such pieces clash with their new schemes of our history and antiquities, stifled them as useless or hurtful; whereas in the darkness we are in, and in the scarcity of historical monuments we labour under by the many repeated disasters befallen them at different times, as we shall show elsewhere, every ancient piece ought to be preserved; that by comparing them one with another, and with other certain accounts, some further light may be had of the state of the northern inhabitants of Britain in ancient times.

2d. I shall at the end of this article set down the full catalogue of the Pictish kings, with the years assigned to each of their reigns in the abstract, both before and after the fifth age down till the end of their monarchy; not that I suppose any certain account can be had of the succession of their kings (no more than of any other of the northern nations not subject to the Roman empire) before they began with the preaching of the gospel to have the use of letters, as I have said, but that it may appear that the ancient people of the Caledonians or Picts, as they had their bards or antiquaries as well as the Britains and Irish, so they were not behind-hand with them in setting up for as ancient a settlement and succession of kings, and upon as good grounds, which would have, no doubt, appeared, if the Picts had continued to subsist in a distinct body of people till

more polished times, to have rectified and reduced to the order of chronology (as others have done) the rude drafts of the ancient succession of their kings, composed by their bards in times of ignorance, such as we have them in the first part of this abstract.

And after all, it cannot be doubted but that the Picts, whilst their kingdom subsisted, had historical monuments, in all appearance as valuable as those of the old Britains or of the Irish; since we find mention made of the ancient annals of the Picts, as well as of the Scots, in a piece written in the twelfth age, to be found in the Appendix.¹ And Fordun² says he had his accounts of them from ancient monuments: and he speaks elsewhere of their chronicles and histories;³ but at the overturning the kingdom of the Picts, and general devastation made in it by the Scots in the heat of the last wars, their chronicles and other ancient records, sacred and civil, generally perished, and nothing (that we can hear of) remained but this imperfect abstract of the succession of their kings.

And even as to this abstract, having met with no other copy of the first part of it, that is, in the times preceding their conversion to Christianity; and there being visible errors in this, especially in the exorbitant number of years assigned to some of the reigns of the kings in those ancient times, and no means left to correct them without the help of a more exact copy,—I shall, as to the chronology of these kings, follow the example of the learned Sir James Ware,⁴ in the account he has given us of the kings of Ireland, before Loegaire, their first king that embraced the Christian religion in the fifth age; and for the same reason, to wit, the uncertainty of all that passed before they received with Christianity the use of letters, I shall, I say, in the series I am to set down of them at the end of this article, begin the chronology of the Pictish kings no higher than the time of their first conversion to Christianity, in the fifth age, and content myself to set down from the abstract the bare names of the kings preceding that age, with the years assigned in the abstract to each of their reigns, leaving the task of calculating them, and reducing them to the order of chronology, to those who in after-times may happen to light upon other copies, by which this may be corrected.

And that there are other copies appears by the account that Lynch gives us in his book, entitled, *Cambrensis eversus*,⁵ where

¹ Append. n. 1.

² ‘De veterum voluminibus.’—*Ford.* lib. 4, c. 9.

³ ‘Ex eorum (Pictorum) chronicis et historiis colligitur.’—*Ford.* lib. 3, c. 53.

⁴ ‘Ad prædecessores Loegarii quod attinet, eos certe consilio omisi, quia pleraque quæ de fīs traduntur (ut quod sentio dicam) aut fabulæ sunt, vel fabulis & anachronismis mire admixta.’—*Waræus de Antiq. Hybern.* c. 4, p. 20.

⁵ *Cambren. eversus*, p. 93.

he not only assures us that he found one of them in a ms. of Nennius the British historian, but sets down the complete catalogue of the Pictish kings from Brude, son of Meilochon, converted by St. Columba ; and for a proof that the catalogue which Lynch had before him was the same with this in the abstract, if he had thought fit to give it us entire, the latter part, which is all that he sets down, agrees perfectly with that of the abstract from King Brude down to their union with the Scots, not only in the names, but in the order of succession, and, making allowance for some few faults of transcribers, in the number of years assigned to each king's reign. And for a further proof that Lynch's catalogue and that of the abstract were the same, they agree in everything in which the catalogue of St. Andrews and that of Fordun differ from that of the abstract.

And I make no doubt but that if sufficient inquiry were made, either this copy that Lynch made use of might be as yet found, or some other of those that the Irish writers mention ; for it is by no means credible that the chief Irish ancient writers would have been so unanimous (as we have seen they are¹⁾ in asserting the number of these seventy Pictish kings, from the beginning down to Constantine, no more than in raising the beginning of the Pictish monarchy as high as that of their own kings of the Milesian race, if they had not had, at the time they wrote, at least catalogues such as this, and other ancient monuments of it ; since they could have no national interest or motive to ascribe to a foreign people the same privilege they chiefly value themselves upon, of being one of the most ancient monarchies in the world.

Now, that the accounts of the Pictish kings which the Irish writers had in view were the same with those of the abstract, will appear in the catalogue I am to set down from it, by two marks or characters which the Irish writers give us : the one is the precise number of seventy kings till Constantine, who reigned in the end of the eighth and beginning of the ninth age ; the other is, that the beginning of the Pictish monarchy reached as high as that of the Irish kings of the Milesian race, from Heremon ; and this second character of them will appear to those that will be at the pains to sum up together the years assigned in this abstract to each of these kings,—to Cruithne the first king, from the ninth year of King Brude, son of Meilochon, which answering, according to Bede, to the year 565 of the incarnation, is a fixed era, by which the chronology of the Pictish kings must be regulated (as far as these first kings' reigns are reducible to a chronological order) both before and after

¹ *Supra*, p. 73.

their conversion, down to their union with the Scots in one people, in the ninth age. I say designedly as far as the reigns of the ancient Pictish kings are reducible to a chronological order; because, having no proof that the Picts, no more than other northern nations without the bounds of the Roman empire, had the use of letters before their conversion to Christianity, the accounts we have of them before that time, barely from their own traditions, can be of little other use than to let us know what opinions the Picts themselves were of in respect to the succession of their kings and beginning of their monarchy, grounded upon the credit of their bards or antiquaries.

I cannot but here observe, that when I consider the difference there is betwixt the first and second part of the abstract of the chronicles of the Picts, before and after they received Christianity, I find in it a sensible proof of what I am often obliged to mention in this essay, to wit, of the distinction that ought to be made, in all pretended ancient historical monuments of the northern nations, betwixt the accounts they give of their history and antiquities, before the times that they became more cultivated and received the use of letters (which, in regard of those that never were subjects of the Roman empire, scarce ever happened till their conversion to Christianity), and the accounts of their history written since the use of letters was received among them. The first kind, when they are exposed in their own native dress, such as they came from the first author's hand (without being refined or corrected by posterior writers, who had more skill, and lived in times of greater light and learning), are generally so inconsistent with all true chronology and history that they can be of little or no other use than at best to let us know what stories passed current among the people whose history they relate, at the time they were written, concerning their ancestors.

But as to the historical accounts we have from writers of the northern nations of what passed since they had the use of letters, I do not think that the uncertain or even fabulous stories that the bards have given of their remote antiquities in the dark ages, ought to hinder their posterior histories, containing accounts of what passed since they had learning among them, from meeting with that acceptance from the learned in other countries that other histories meet with, in proportion to their agreement with other received histories, and with the rules of chronology.

And nothing can contribute so much to make these historical accounts, written in times of light and learning, be received by the learned, as to be careful to distinguish exactly betwixt them and the uncertain and fabulous relations of bards, a set of illi-

terate men, in ancient times; and besides, as we shall observe elsewhere, branded by all writers, ancient and modern, with the characters of being generally governed in their rhapsodies by passion and interest. As nothing, on the contrary, is more capable to decry the history of any country, and take away the credit of it among the judicious and learned in other countries, than for an author to put the bards' accounts of it, in remote ages, on a level with the histories written in times of learning, and to seem to give equal credit to both, and make use indifferently of them for vouchers of what an author gives for the history of his country, it is for this reason that I found it necessary to make so different a judgment of the first and second part of this abstract of the Pictish chronicle, as, indeed, it was one of the chief motives that engaged me to undertake this critical essay in general on the ancient inhabitants of our country.

But to return from this digression, and continue my observations on the abstract, it remains to treat of the differences that are betwixt the names, number, and series of the Pictish kings, such as they are set down in this abstract, both in the first and second part of it, and those contained in our Scotish catalogues.

As to the differences we meet with in the first part, containing the Pietish kings before Christianity and the use of letters were received among them, it is to be observed, that from the disappearance of the Picts as a distinct people under their own name, the body of the nation, since they became subject to the Scots, having been by degrees, from the ninth to the twelfth or thirteenth age, cemented and incorporated in one body of people with the Scots, so as to disappear under their own name, thence arose the notion of a total destruction or extirpation of the Picts. And the Scots having already received the opinion of their own ancient settlement in Britain before the incarnation, their writers, by a mistaken notion of honour, as if it had been a more glorious achievement to the Scotish conquerors to have extirpated a whole nation than to have simply subdued them, and, upon their subjection, to have incorporated and united them into one body of people with themselves,—the Scotish writers, I say, upon this affected to render the Picts as well inferior to the Scots in the antiquity of their settlement in Britain and monarchy, as they had been in the success of their last war.

The Scotish writers, then, having already fixed the coming in and first settlement of the Scots in Britain about four hundred years before the incarnation, thought, it seems, it would be a disparagement to them to allow the Picts, a people they had

vanquished, and either quite rooted out or forced to become their subjects, the precedence in antiquity of settlement, and an ancient succession of kings that far transcended theirs; therefore, every one of the Scottish writers, after raising their own antiquity to an incredible height, seem to vie one with another who shall bring lowest the time of the settlement of the Picts in Britain, and the beginning of their monarchy.

The Latin chronicle in verse or rhyme (set down in the Appendix to this work¹) says that the Pictish kingdom lasted only 1224 years and nine months; by consequence it could not have begun sooner than about 374 years before the birth of Christ. Another Scottish writer, mentioned in the additions to Fordun's chronicle,² hath it that the reign of the Picts lasted in all 1187 years and nine months, and so must have begun only about 337 years before the incarnation. Fordun³ says that they reigned in Britain 1100 years and more; but he quotes a writer⁴ that had advanced that the Scots were in possession of the northern parts of the island 300 years before the Picts; and notwithstanding the zeal he had to raise the Scottish antiquities, he gives not in to that high flight, but seems willing⁵ to allow a precedence of settlement to the Picts, or that both the Picts and Scots settled in Britain about the same time. In fine, Winton's chronicle⁶ and others give only 1061 years to the duration of the Pictish monarchy; so, according to them, it could not have begun sooner than about 211 years before the incarnation; nay, by the additions to Fordun's chronicle,⁷ it appears that some Scottish writers have gone that length to suppose that there were twenty-three Scottish kings before the Picts.

It was not so with foreign writers, who had no emulation nor quarrel with the Picts. For besides Ralph Higden,⁸ from *Giraldus Cambrensis*, who says he had seen writers that gave the Pictish monarchy in Britain 1360 years of duration, that is, 510 years before the incarnation, we have seen the Irish⁹ old writers gave the Pictish monarchy the same antiquity and

¹ ‘Qui Picti terram rexere mille ducentis, & pariter junctis viginti quatuor annis, ut verum renovem, mensibus atque novem.’—Append. n. 6, c. 5.

² *Scotichron. magnum* in bibl. regia, Lond. & alibi, lib. 4, c. 10.

³ *Fordun*, lib. 4, c. 9, p. 295, edit. Hern.

⁴ *Fordun*, ibid.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Winton*, lib. 1, cc. 8, 19.

⁷ ‘Quamvis quædam sunt chronice quæ Scotos asserunt præ Pictis, secundum quasdam chronicas 317, secundum alias 265 annis, 8 mensibus, & secundum alias 249 annis & tribus mensibus hanc possidere regionem. Summa regum Scotorum ante Pictos 23.’—*Scotichron. magnum*, lib. 4, c. 10.

⁸ *Polichron.* edit. Gale, p. 185.

⁹ *Supra*, p. 73.

number of kings that we find by this abstract the Picts gave themselves.

So, upon the whole, it can scarce be doubted but the retrenchments made by the Scottish writers, both in the antiquity of the Pictish settlement and in the names and number of their kings, were occasioned chiefly by the motives already mentioned, and made with a design to lessen the Picts, and to raise the precedence of the Scots over them in everything that appeared honourable to the nation.

Hence, it seems, the difference we find betwixt the abstract and the Scottish catalogues in the number of ancient Pictish kings before they embraced Christianity chiefly proceeded. Our Scottish writers having, as appears, chosen out of the authentic catalogues of these kings (which I cannot doubt but that they had in ancient times, especially at St. Andrews) such a number of them, with the years of their reigns, as that all these years, summed up together, might not exceed, or even amount to, the antiquity which the Scots had given to their own settlement in Britain. For a proof of this, it suffices to sum up the years of the Pictish reigns, as they are set down in the two Scottish catalogues, from the fixed era of the ninth year of King Brude, son of Meilochon, concurring with the year of our Lord 565, till the beginning of the reign of Cruithne, first king of the Picts, and it will be found that the years of all their reigns, according to Fordun, amount only to 289 years before the incarnation, and those of the catalogue of St. Andrews only to 237 at most; whereas the Scottish writers place the settlement of the Scots in Britain above 400 years before the incarnation.

All this considered, I do not see that the difference which we find in the number of kings betwixt the abstract of the Pictish chronicle and Scottish catalogues, in these ancient times, can furnish any sufficient argument against the antiquity of the settlement and monarchy of the Picts in Britain, or the number of their kings, or give any just ground to doubt that the abstract is not authentic.

As to the differences which we meet with betwixt the Scottish catalogues of the Pictish kings and that of the abstract in the second part of it, that is, in the times following after the conversion of the Picts, from the fifth or sixth age downwards, we have already shown that the preference is absolutely due to the series of these kings contained in the abstract, as being entirely conformable to all other British histories that make mention of the Picts; whereas the series set down in the Scottish catalogues cannot, without great alterations, be made to agree with them: so the chief use that can be made of these catalogues is to help

to rectify some of the names set down in the abstract, in which the writer appears to have often followed the Irish or Gaelic idiotism in the pronunciation and spelling of the names, which makes many of them appear very different from the same names as they are set down in the Scottish catalogues; but I shall leave the judgment of that to those that are more skilled in the old Scottish or Irish language, after setting down my own remarks upon the subject.

And, in the first place, these alterations and changes are very common in all copies of catalogues of ancient proper names, which by length of time are grown out of use, especially when transcribed by those who did not understand the language of the people whose names they are, which is certainly the present case; besides those variations which the negligence as well as the ignorance of transcribers is ordinarily the cause of; so that the oftener they are transcribed the more they are disfigured, each transcriber adding new faults of his own to those that he found before; whence it happens, that in length of time they appear quite different names. This may be observed in the names set down in the genealogical series of the kings of Scotland, as we meet with them in most of our modern Scottish writers, both ms. and printed, when compared with copies written by those that knew the old Scottish or Gaelic language. The same kind of variations happen in the British or Welch tongue, as may be seen in Humphrey Lhuyd's¹ description of Britain.

It is, then, no wonder that the like alterations and variety should be met with in the different copies of the names of the Pictish kings, these being more ancient, and oftener transcribed by writers of different languages and pronunciation; but as these alterations are frequent, not only in the names of the Pictish kings, but in those also of the ancient Scottish kings, and in general throughout most words of the old Scottish or Gaelic, the same with the Irish, which (to speak grammatically) frequently appear quite different in the oblique cases from what they are in the nominative,—for these reasons I shall here venture to set down some general remarks that may contribute to reconcile the various ways of spelling in which we find these names in the several copies that we have of the ancient Scottish and Pictish kings.

And 1st. It is to be observed, that in most other languages, both vulgar and in the Greek and Latin, the alterations by which the oblique cases in nouns are distinguished from the nominative, fall generally upon the final syllables or terminations; whereas in Gaelic or old Scottish, the same with the

¹ H. Ludd. Fragment. Brit. descript. fol. 1, 2, 3.

Irish, these alterations fall upon the first or second syllable, and sometimes on both. 2d. This alteration in Gaelic is generally marked by adding an H, or, to abridge, by adding simply a point, which stands for an H, above the first or second consonant of the oblique cases. 3d. The effect of this additional H is different, according to the nature of the different consonants to which it is joined. Thus H added to B and M, makes them be pronounced V, W, or F. Thus we find Domnall, which in the oblique cases is written Domnhuil, pronounced and written Dovenal or Dofnal. H being added to C and P, they are pronounced Ch, Ph. D with an H is pronounced G or C; as, Mac-dhonuil, pronounced Macgonuel or Maconuil. H after G breaks it into U or W; as, Eogan, written Eoghan in the oblique, is pronounced Ewen or Uven, turned into Evenus by our modern writers. F, S, T, joined to H, do commonly lose their sound, and the H alone is pronounced; as, Fergus, Fhergus, pronounced Hergus; whence Hurgus, Urguist.

Besides these there are: 1st. Changes of consonants, such as F into V and W, D into T, and reciprocally. 2d. Changes of vowels, A into I; as, Mac, a son; Mhic, pronounced Vic, of a son. I into U; as, Bride and Brude are the same name. Oe into U and A; as, Oengus, Hungus, Unnust, and Angus are all the same; so are also Brude, Brede, Bride; likewise Durst, Drust, and Drest; and these, Fothe, Fathe, and Wide, F being pronounced W, and in old mss. in the Saxon character, the Saxon Th, written ð, is mistaken by transcribers for a D. Feredeth and Wredeth, Feret and Wred, all the same. The C is always pronounced K; as, Cineoch, Cainach, Kinoth, and Keneth are the same name; and Naitan, Nectan, and Nethan. It is to be also remarked, that in mss. of the fifteenth age, the Ch and Th are written generally so alike one to another, that they can scarce be distinguished. Hence arise the common mistakes of our modern writers in the names Eocha, Echach, Erch, etc., which they call Ethodius, Erth, etc., which in general is a sure sign that the copies they followed were of the fifteenth, or beginning of the sixteenth age, as we shall see elsewhere. Thus I have met with one of our king's names vulgarly Achajus, but in the Gaelic, Eocha; I have met with it, in different mss., in these nine different forms: Eocha, Eachach, Echach, Ethach, Eochuid or Eoghuid, Eokal, Ethasi, Achajus, Achilaus. All this by the mistakes of transcribers. It is also to be remarked, that the same Th or Ch is, by a like mistake or false reading, changed in the termination of names, oftentimes in a D or ð; as, Ethod or Ethad, for Ecchach or Eochach; and sometimes in L; as, Eokal for Eochach, Kenel for Keneth, in Gaelic, Cineoch; the C, Gaelic, as I observed above, being pronounced K. By the

same errors of transcribers the name of one of our kings in Gaelic, Gabran in the nominative case, is Gabhran in the oblique, and pronounced Gavran or Gauran, which our modern writers have turned into Gouran, Goran, and Conranus. By these and such other observations, and a necessary allowance for the faults of transcribers, such of the names of the Pictish kings as are in the Scottish catalogues may be easily reconciled, and will be found the same generally as those in the abstract, however they appear at first to be different.

SERIES OR SUCCESSION OF THE PICTISH KINGS, according to the Abstract of their Chronicles, set down in the Appendix, Number 2, under the title it bears in the ms. of *Chronica de Origine Antiquorum Pictorum*.

First Part.

| Kings' Names. | Reigned. |
|---|----------|
| 1. Cruidne or Cruithne, son of Cinge or Kinne, father of the Picts dwelling in this island, | 100 |
| 2. Circui 60, | — |
| 3. Fidaich 40, | — |
| 4. Forteim 70, | — |
| 5. Floclaid 30, | — |
| 6. Got. 12, | — |
| 7. Ce, i.e. Cecircum 15, | — |
| 8. Fibaid 24, ¹ | — |
| 9. Gedeolgudach, | 80 |
| 10. Denbacan, | 100 |
| 11. Olsinecta, | 60 |
| 12. Guididgaedbrecach, | 50 |
| 13. Gestgurtich, | 40 |
| 14. Wurgest, | 30 |
| 15. Brudebout, ² | 48 |
| 16. Gilgidi, | 101 |
| 17. Tharan, | 100 |
| 18. Morleo, | 15 |
| 19. Deocilunanan, | 40 |

¹ All these seven are in the abstract called sons, which may be understood descendants of Cruithne. But supposing they were all sons of Cruithne, it follows that they must have all reigned at the same time with him, and have had different portions of Albany assigned to each of them under their father, as reguli, princes, or governors each of a province; and so of the seven provinces into which Albany was anciently divided, according to the old description of it set down in the Appendix, n. 1.

² The ms. adds, that from this Brudebout there descended thirty kings of the name of Brude, who reigned during 150 years in Ireland and in Albany; their names are set down thus: Brude Pant, Brude Urpant, Brude Leo, Brude Uleo, Brude Gant, Brude Urgant, and the rest that may be seen in the piece itself in the Appendix.

I shall only here remark, that according to this piece it seems there was in ancient times a colony of Picts in Ireland. Whether the Cruthnii or Cruthini, mentioned by Usher¹ from Adamnan, were the descendants of those?

¹ Usher, Antiq. Brit. p. 302.

| Kings' Names. | Reigned. |
|------------------------------|----------|
| 20. Cimoiod fil. Arcois, . | 7 |
| 21. Deord, . | 50 |
| 22. Blicibliterth, . | 5 |
| 23. Dectoteric frater Diu, . | 40 |
| 24. Usconbutz, . | 30 |
| 25. Carvorst, . | 40 |
| 26. Deoartavois, . | 20 |
| 27. Uist, . | 50 |
| 28. Ru, . | 100 |
| 29. Gartnaithboc, . | 4 |
| 30. Vere, . | 9 |
| 31. Breth. fil. Buthut, . | 7 |
| 32. Vipoignamet, . | 30 |
| 33. Canutulachama, . | 4 |
| 34. Wradech vechla, . | 2 |
| 35. Garnaichdi uber, . | 60 |
| 36. Talore filius Achivir, . | 75 |
| 37. Drust. fil. Erp, . | — |

Both the abstract and copy of St. Andrews have 'Drust fil. Erp or Urb, regn. or rexit C. annis & C. bella peregit,' where there is a palpable error in both these copies in the word regn. or rexit being written instead of vixit, as both a copy quoted by Fordun¹ and that of James Gray, taken from the old records of St. Andrews, have it in these words: 'Drust or Durst, fil. Urb or Irb, 100 an. vixit, & 100 bella peregit.' And Fordun adds, that he reigned only forty-five years; according to which, summing up the reigns of the other Pictish kings, as they are set down exactly in the abstract, from the year of Christ 565, concurring with the ninth of the reign of Brude, son of Meinlochon (which is the era by which all the reigns of these kings are to be regulated),—according to Fordun's account, I say, which assigns forty-five years to the reign of this Durst, the beginning of it will answer to the year 406, and it will end A.D. 451, when he was succeeded by Talore or Talarg, son of Amyl.

By this calculation it appears that it was during the reign of this Durst that the gospel was first preached to the Picts by St. Ninian, in the beginning of the fifth century, and afterwards by St. Palladius and St. Patrick to the Scots and Irish, betwixt A.D. 430 and 440. And here ends the first part of the abstract of the Pictish chronicles, which contains the account of the succession of their kings in the times of ignorance preceding their conversion to Christianity, when, it is like, they first received the use of letters. So it is no wonder that this first part of the abstract is not conformable to the rules of chronology, with which the first compilers of it were probably very little acquainted, besides the many errors occasioned by the negligence or ignorance of transcribers. For these reasons, as I have already remarked, I have not attempted to reduce this first part

¹ Ford. lib. 4, c. 10.

to the order of chronology, as I am about to do the second, which is an easy work, being entirely conformable to the rules of chronology, and all we meet with in history concerning the Picts.

Second Part.

| Kings' Names. | Began to reign. | Reigned. |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| 37. Drust fil. Erp or Irb, | | 406 45 |
| 38. Talore fil. Aniel, | | 451 4 |
| 39. Necton morbet fil. Erp, ¹ | | 455 25 |
| 40. Drest Gurthlinmoth, | | 480 30 |
| 41. Galanan etelich, | | 510 12 |
| 42. Dadrest, | | 522 1 |
| 43. { Drest fil. Gyrom } 43. { Drest fil. Udrost } Drest fil. Gyrom solus, | { 523 { 524 | 1 5 529 5 |
| 44. Gartnach fil. Gyrom, | | 534 7 |
| 45. Cealtraim fil. Gyrom, | | 541 1 |
| 46. Talorg. fil. Muircholaich, | | 542 11 |
| 47. Drest fil. Munait, | | 553 1 |
| 48. Galam cum Aleth, —cum Brideo, | | 554 1 555 1 |
| 49. Bride fil. Maileon, five Meilochon, ² | | 556 30 |
| 50. Garntaich fil. Domelch, | | 586 11 |
| 51. Nectan nepos Uerb., | | 597 20 |
| 52. Cineoeh fil. Luthru, | | 617 19 |
| 53. Garnard fil. Wid., | | 636 4 |
| 54. Brude fil. Wid., | | 640 5 |
| 55. Talore frater eorum, | | 645 12 |
| 56. Talorcan fil. Enfret, | | 657 4 |
| 57. Gartnait fil. Domuel, | | 661 6 |
| 58. Drest frater ejus, | | 667 7 |
| 59. Brude fil. Bili, ³ | | 674 21 |
| 60. Taran fil. Entisidich, | | 695 4 |
| 61. Brede fil. Derili, | | 699 11 |
| 62. Necton seu Naitan fil. Derili, ⁴ | | 710 15 |
| 63. Drest & Alpin, reigned together, | | 725 5 |
| 64. Onnust sive Oengus fil. Urgust sive Fergus, ⁵ | | 730 31 |
| 65. Brede fil. Uurgust, | | 761 2 |
| 66. Kiniod sive Kinoth fil. Wirlech, ⁶ | | 763 12 |
| 67. Elpin sive Alpin fil. Wroid, | | 775 3½ |
| 68. Drest sive Durst fil. Talorgan, | | 779 4½ |
| 69. Talorgan fil. Onnust, | | 783 2½ |

¹ 'Tertio anno regni ejus Darlungtach Abbatissa,' &c., as in the abstract in the Appendix, n. 2.

² 'viii. anno regni ejus baptizatus est a St. Columba.' So the ms. of the abstract hath it, where there is wanting a fourth i after the v to make it viii., that is, the ninth year of Brude's reign, as Bede hath it.

³ This is he who killed in battle Egfrid, king of Northumberland, and destroyed most of his army, A.D. 685, as we have elsewhere shown from Bede and the continuator of Nennius, *supra*, p. 77.

⁴ It was to this King Naitan that Ceolfrid, abbot of Wiremouth, wrote the famous letter about Easter and the Tonsure, A.D. 715, as we have shown from Bede's history, and his life of Ceolfrid, *supra*, p. 78.

⁵ This Onnust's death is marked by Roger Houeden and Simeon of Durham in the year 761, conformable to the suppuration of this chronicle, *supra*, p. 78.

⁶ It was to this King Kinoth that Alered, king of Northumberland, fled for refuge, A.D. 774, as Honeden and Simeon have recorded it; they also fix his death to the year 775, *supra*, p. 78.

| | Kings' Names. | Began to reign. | Reigned. |
|-----|--|-----------------|----------|
| 70. | Canaul fil. Tarla, ¹ | 786 | 5 |
| | Castantin sive Constantine fil. Urguist sive | | |
| | Fergus, | 791 | 30 |
| | Unnust sive Hungus fil. Urguist, | 821 | 12 |
| | Drest fil. Constantine & Talorgan fil. Uthoil, | | |
| | reigned together, ² | 833 | 3 |
| | Uwen fil. Unnust sive Eogan fil. Hungi, | 836 | 3 |
| | Wrad. fil. Bargoit. Keneth MacAlpin Rex | | |
| | Scotorum, | 839 | 3 |
| | Bred sive Brude, | 842 | 1 |
| | Keneth MacAlpin, king of Albany, ³ | 843 | 16 |

Here ends the series of the Pictish kings, according to the abstract and Lynch's catalogue; and this period agrees perfectly with the era of the beginning of Keneth MacAlpin's reign over all Albany, which, according to all ancient writers that treat of it, lasted 16 years. For King Keneth died 'idib. Februari. feria tertia,' according to a short but ancient chronicle of the first kings of Albany, to be found here in the Appendix, n. 3, taken from the ms. of Colbert's library, already mentioned. Now this character of the Ides or thirteenth day of February concurring with the third Ferie, which is Tuesday, can only agree to the year 858, which is, according to the account now in use, the year 859; and by no means to the year 854, where, according to Fordun and our Scotish historians, Keneth's death is placed. Now, subtracting the sixteen years of Keneth's reign over all Albany, from A.D. 858 or 859, the beginning of it, and by consequence the period of the Pictish monarchy under their own name, must have happened A.D. 842 or 843; which perfectly agrees with the abstract of their chronicles, and is a new confirmation of the authenticity and exactness of the second part of it, down from the time that the gospel was preached to the Picts, and shows the preference that it deserves before all the Scotish or any other catalogues.

As to the three Pictish kings, Keneth, Brude, and Durst or Drusken, that are added in the Scotish catalogues after Brude, the last Pictish king set down in the abstract, and by Lynch, if there were any such, it is like that they have been set up one after another with the title of kings, by a party of the Picts that stood out, and continued to dispute Keneth MacAlpin's right during the six years assigned to their reigns after Keneth was generally owned king of all Albany. But I may have occasion

¹ These are the seventy Pictish kings that succeeded one after another from Cruithne to Constantine, mentioned in the most ancient histories of Ireland.

² The Scotish catalogues join these two kings' names in one, and call him Durstolorg, which is a visible error.

³ Keneth MacAlpin, king of Albany, having subdued the Picts, reigned sixteen years.

to treat this matter more distinctly in the second part of this essay.

ART. VIII.—*Of the Union of the Pictish and Scotish Kingdoms in one Monarchy.*

All our writers do agree, that the union of the kingdoms of the Picts and Scots happened towards the middle of the ninth age ; that Keneth MacAlpin was the first monarch of the united kingdoms. All our modern writers do also agree, that as Keneth was by hereditary succession king of the Scots, he had an equal title to the kingdom of the Picts, in the right of his father Alpin, son to Eocha or Achajus ; Alpin having laid claim to the Pictish crown as next heir, after the death of King Eogan, son to Hungus, whose daughter Fergusia, being married to Achajus, king of the Scots, conveyed to her son Alpin the right to the Pictish crown, preferable to any other pretender, after the death of his uncle Eogan.

This account of the title and claim of the Scotish kings to the Pictish crown, as next heirs by right of blood, is unanimously delivered by all our Scotish writers after Fordun ; such as Boece,¹ Buchanan,² Lesly,³ Chambers,⁴ &c. Fordun,⁵ indeed, does not specify, as they do, the particular degree of blood and relation on which the claim of the Scotish kings was grounded ; yet he tells us that the king of Scots laid claim as heir to the Pictish crown, and that this claim was the ground of the quarrel that occasioned the last war betwixt the Picts and the Scots ; and when he seems afterwards to be in doubt about the cause of the overthrow of their kingdom, it is clear he means there the first cause, by his recurring to the judgments of God on that people for their sins ; and the other examples⁶ he brings at large of the overthrow of kingdoms and states for their sins, do all prove that this was his meaning. Another writer, set down here in the Appendix,⁷ more ancient than Fordun, specifies more particularly the sins of the Picts that brought the judgments of God upon them ; but it is evident that both these last writers speak of the first and original causes of the overthrow of the Pictish kingdom, and not of the immediate cause or occasion of the last war betwixt the Scots and the Picts. There is no doubt, in general, but that those heavy judgments of Almighty God, by which kingdoms, states, and empires are overthrown, are generally drawn upon them by the sins and wickedness of the in-

¹ Boeth. lib. 10.

² Buchanan. lib. 6, fol. 57, in Dugal.

³ Lesl. lib. 5, p. 180.

⁴ David. Chambr. d'Ormond, fol. 99.

⁵ Fordun, lib. 3, c. 53.

⁶ Ibid. lib. 4, cc. 5, 6, 7.

⁷ Append. n. 3.

habitants; but we are inquiring here into the immediate cause of the last war betwixt the Picts and Scots, whereby such great numbers of the leading men among the Picts were cut off, and which ended in the extinction of the Pictish monarchy in their own name. And Fordun informs us it was occasioned, as we have observed, by the Scots laying claim to the Pictish crown. And all our posterior historians set down in particular the ground of this claim as we have related it; and in this they are followed by English¹ and Irish² authors that have written concerning this point. Nor are our modern historians contradicted in this by other more ancient writers, as they are in what they relate of our remote antiquities; besides, that there being, no doubt, several historical monuments extant in the time of Boece and Buchanan, that are now perished, of the affairs of Scotland since the reign of Fergus son of Erch, there is ground to believe that they would not have been so positive and particular in the account they give of the right of the kings of Scotland to the Pictish crown, if they had not found ancient authority for it, especially considering this fact could be of no use to what appears to have been the principal design they aimed at in their history, of which in its proper place.

And this account of our kings claiming an hereditary right to the kingdom of the Picts is confirmed by the title of kings of the Picts given to Keneth MacAlpin and some of his successors, after the union of the two kingdoms, as we shall presently show. But the great men among the Picts having in prejudice of King Alpin's right set up for a king one Feret, otherwise called Wred, of the Pictish blood, thence ensued a war betwixt the two nations, in which King Alpin was taken and put to death by the Picts. To him succeeded his son Keneth, who having by a stratagem inspired the Scots with courage, whom their late defeat had much disheartened, the war was renewed, and carried on with greater eagerness on both sides, and at last proved fatal to the Picts, who being several times defeated, and great numbers of the most warlike and leading men of the Picts being cut off, the rest submitted; and so the whole kingdom, being subdued by Keneth, was united into one with that of the Scots.

By this it appears that whatever opposition King Keneth might have met with at first in his pretensions to the Pictish crown from the generality of the nation, he, having asserted his title by his victories, and at last by their submission, became lawful sovereign, as well of the Picts as of the Scots, not only by conquest, but in the right of his father Alpin, only lawful heir of both, and was the first monarch of all Albany or Scot-

¹ Holingshead, p. 169.

² Kenedy, Geneal. pp. 182, 184.

land ; and all our kings being ever since lineally descended of him, are by consequence lawful successors as well of the Pictish as of the Scotish kings, and may equally reckon the number of their royal predecessors from the first king of the Picts as from the first of the Scots. And thus independently of the royal line of the Scots come from Ireland, the kings of Scotland were in the royal line of the Picts, and as succeeding to the Pictish kings by the right of blood and by that of conquest, the most ancient monarchs in Europe ; and this with the concurring testimony both of our own historians and of those of Ireland.

ART. IX.—*That the present Inhabitants of Scotland are as well the offspring and race of the Picts as of the Scots.*

But not only the ancient succession of the Pictish monarchy subsisted still in the Scotish line by King Keneth and his posterity, lawful heirs of the Pictish kings, as well by blood as by conquest, but the body of the Pictish people, all over these provinces of Scotland which were possessed by them, having submitted to Keneth, and owned his title, remained still for the most part, and their posterity after them ; and the Picts, after the union, are often mentioned by their own name, till by degrees, in succeeding ages, they were thoroughly intermixed and incorporated into one people with the Scots. In the same manner as the ancient Gauls and the Franks, the ancient Spaniards and the Goths, and so many other nations which, upon the decay of the Roman empire, seized upon the several provinces of it, grew up, by frequent alliances and internarrriages, into one people with the ancient inhabitants ; so that it were impossible, at present, for the generality of private families to discover or make out of which of the two, whether of the ancient or later inhabitants, they are the descendants.

From this mixture of the Picts with the Scots it followed that the Scots being the governing nation, and the Picts becoming their subjects, the name of the former prevailed, and that of the Picts was eclipsed by degrees, as both these people grew into one in the following ages, after their being united under one monarch ; so that after the twelfth age we have no further account of the Picts as a distinct people in Scotland. The Pictish language ceased also as a distinct language from the Gaelic or old Scotish, which, being at the time of the union of the two kingdoms the language of the court and of the ruling part of the united kingdoms, got soon the upper hand of the Pictish; and this last did so much the sooner and more easily disappear, as the change from the one language to the other was very easy and natural, the Pictish and Gaelic, as well as the British,

being, as far as appears, but three different dialects of the same mother-tongue, to wit, the Celtic.

And as we see the English tongue (being a compound of Saxon and French, originally Gothic, and so entirely different from the Gaelic) hath since the reign of Malcolm Keanmore, at which time the Saxon began to be the language of the court, and daily more that of the governing part of the kingdom of Scotland, so wore out by degrees the Gaelic or ancient Scotish (though the native language of the inhabitants) that it is almost reduced to the corners and extremities of the kingdom; the like happened to the Pictish language—the Saxon to the south, and the Gaelic to the north of the friths, gaining such ground daily upon it, that at last it was quite extinct. Thus both the name of the Picts and their language were so worn out by the middle of the twelfth age, that we have from that time no more account of them as a distinct people from the Scots, than if the whole race of them had been cut off like one man that had left no posterity.

This universal disappearance of the Picts, and of their language, gave occasion to Henry Huntington,¹ an English historian, about the middle of the twelfth age, to write that the Picts seemed then so far extinct, and their language so utterly destroyed, that all that was recorded of them in ancient history appeared a mere fable. Upon which he makes a good moral reflection on the uncertainty of human things. But Huntington lived at a distance from Scotland, and was not so well acquainted with the transactions, even of his own time, in the north betwixt the Scots and English, as was Richard Prior of Hexham, who lived in the time, and near the borders, and gives us this account, that in the famous battle of the Standard, A.D. 1138, a part of the Scots army, under King David, was composed of Picts, as we shall afterwards more fully set down.

However, this extinction of the Pictish language, and of their name as a distinct people from the Scots, gave rise to the story of a general massacre made of them by King Keneth; which, by posterior historians, was improved to a total extirpation of the race of Picts, man, woman, and child. So in the writers after the twelfth age, and downwards, we frequently meet with expressions importing that King Keneth destroyed them: ‘*destruxit & delevit Pictos.*’ Fordun and Buchanan make some exceptions, as we shall observe; but Boece,² after relating many general massacres of the Picts by Keneth’s order, brings him in making a most barbarous decree to kill man, woman, and child, and executing it accordingly upon all the remains of the Pictish

¹ Hen. Hunting. Hist. lib. 1, fol. 171.

² Boeth. Hist. Scot. lib. 10, fol. 198, n. 60, 70, &c.; fol. 200, n. 1, 10.

race, who, he says, had got together in the Utopian city of Camelodunum in Pictland. But, in reality, the story of such a general destruction and rooting out of a whole nation, more numerous and powerful than the Scots themselves, is both improbable and repugnant to the truth of history.

For, in the first place, not to insist upon the barbarity of such an inhuman action as the cutting off a whole nation, without distinction of age, sex, or quality, would have been, the thing in itself seems incredible, that Keneth, by the assistance of the Scots only, could so far become master of all the Pictish nation as to be able to extirpate it, if we consider the large possessions and extent of the Pictish territories, which, as we have shown, far exceeded the Scotish, as they did in number and strength; the Scots being confined as yet to some of the western provinces and isles, nothing less than a miracle could have effected such a total overthrow. Whereas, in the supposition I make, after our historians, that King Keneth succeeded to the Pictish throne with the opposition only of most of the chief of their leading men, whilst many of the rest of them favoured his title, the union of the two kingdoms might be more easily compassed, and his right asserted by ordinary course.

If we consider, 2d, the situation of affairs in Britain about Keneth's time, and that the Danes¹ (who about the end of the eighth century had invaded Ireland, and ravaged the Isle of Ycolmkill, at the one end of North Britain, and Holy Island and the northern parts of England at the other)—that these Danes, during Keneth's reign, invaded Britain with great fleets,—if, I say, all this be considered, it would have been the most impolitic thing Keneth could have done, and against all the dictates of prudence, to have so far weakened his united kingdom as totally to cut off the best part and strength of the inhabitants, and expose his depopulated kingdom as an easy prey to any invader; besides the bad consequences of the greatest part of it lying uncultivated, the Scots alone not being able, for many ages, to come to make up the number of the ancient inhabitants, and cultivate their lands; and yet all this must have happened if the Picts were utterly extirpated, as Boece and others will have it.

3d. As to John Fordun,² though he says, in one place, that Keneth used the Picts with great cruelty, sparing neither age nor sex, yet this was only in the first heat and fury of war; for he says elsewhere, that the strength of the Pictish forces being crushed in several battles, and most of their leading men cut off

¹ Warei Antiq. Hyber. pp. 120, 122. Sim. Dunelm. X. Script. Houeden, fol. 232, n. 30.

² Fordun, lib. 4, c. 4, p. 660.

or fleeing, the generality of the Picts submitted, and Keneth¹ marched through their provinces, and received into peace and allegiance the harmless people. Now, to conceive how far this account given by Fordun reaches of the harmless people through all the Pictish provinces submitting to Keneth, it suffices to remark, besides what we have shown elsewhere of the extent of the Pictish provinces, what according to Jo. Major,² King Robert Bruce told his soldiers at the battle of Banocburn that Keneth possessed scarcely the third part of Scotland when he overcame the Picts; and since the Picts possessed almost all the rest, and there is no certain account of any considerable alteration among the inhabitants since Keneth's time, it seems clearly to follow that a great part of the commons on the north side of the friths, and many on the south, are of Pictish extraction.

Buchanan³ also, though he seems in his history to follow Boece, his constant guide, and to assert a general massacre of the Picts, yet in his preliminary dissertations on the British antiquities,⁴ contained in the three first books of his history, and much more elaborate than the history itself,—in these, I say, he limits the destruction of the Picts to those bearing arms, and doubts not but there remained still, after that, great numbers of the Picts intermixed with the Scots.

4th. Such an universal massacre of a powerful nation, famous in all ancient and modern histories, could not fail to be recorded as one of the most memorable events that happened in that age, in all histories, if not of Europe, at least in those of Britain and Ireland in the neighbourhood, for we have none of our own now remaining till many ages after that time; and yet there is not only nothing recorded of the utter destruction or extirpation of the Picts by the Scots, but not so much as any notice or indication of any such thing in any historian, either within or without Britain or Ireland, neither of the ninth age, when this destruction of the Picts is said to have happened, nor in any writer for 300 years after; till, by length of time the Pictish language being worn out, and the Picts and Scots thoroughly united under one name of Scots, so that neither the name or language of Picts appearing more, gave occasion to Huntington, and others after him, to write that the Picts seemed quite abolished, because they heard no more of them by that name.

¹ '[Kenethus] Quasque provincias regni Pictorum peragrando, populum imbellem sub fide pacis suscepit.'—*Fordun*, lib. 4, c. 8, p. 662.

² 'Tertiam hujus regni portionem vix Kenedus noster habuit, quando superbissimos, pugnacissimosque Pictos fudit.'—*Jo. Major. Hist. Scot.* lib. 5, c. 2, fol. 85.

³ Buchanan, *Hist.* lib. 5, fol. 49.

⁴ '[Pictorum reliquias.] Extinctâ militari ætate multas fuisse oportet.'—*Buchan.* lib. 2, fol. 16, n. 30.

Not only no historian for 300 years after the union of Picts and Scots takes any notice, or gives so much as the least insinuation, of this total subversion of the Picts, but, on the contrary, they mention them as still in being long after that, as we shall remark afterwards. And the accounts we have from the best historians of our neighbourhood concerning the Picts, about the times of King Keneth and his successors, not only contradict the barbarous notion of a total extirpation, but exactly agree with the scheme of the union of the Picts and Scots under one monarch, and of King Keneth's succeeding by an hereditary right to the Pictish kings, as I have above set down. Thus Keneth and his successors, as we have already observed, are called kings of the Picts in the appendix to Nennius the British historian, quoted by Lynch¹ in the Ulster annals, as Usher² and O'Flaherty³ have remarked; and Keneth is styled king of the Picts by Caradock, the Welch historian, according to the same Usher⁴; from which it follows, not only that the Picts subsisted after the union of the two kingdoms made by Keneth, since it had been ridiculous for him or his successors to assume the title of kings of a people that were no more in being; for Keneth is called *Rex Pictorum*, and not *Rex Pictiniae* or *Pictaviae*, which were the names of their kingdom.

And I doubt not but that if we had extant any writer of our own country contemporary to, or near, the time of the union of the Scots and Picts, we should find Keneth and his successors recorded as well kings of the Picts as of the Scots, and also meet with abundance of proofs of the Picts subsisting after the union; but we have no writers now remaining of any note till long after the name of Picts, as well as the people themselves, by being incorporated and intermixed thoroughly into one people with the Scots, as entirely disappeared as if they had been quite rooted out; so no wonder if our later writers gave not to Keneth or his successors the title of king of a people whom they supposed were no more in being. And thence it happened, that though it is not to be doubted but Fordun, and such other of our writers as wrote after him, in the fourteenth and fifteenth age, had before them more ancient histories which might have afforded greater light into the Pictish affairs, yet all these later writers, struck with the total disappearance of the Pictish people and language, thought it a greater honour to Keneth and the Scots, according to the depraved taste of those ignorant times, to set them out as having generally extirpated

¹ Lynch, *Cambren. Eversus*, p. 93.

² Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* p. 375.

³ Flaherty, *Ogygia*, pp. 483, 484, &c.

⁴ Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* p. 375. *Vardæi in vit. S. Rumoldi.*

such a numerous and powerful people, than to have barely subdued them, and united them into one people with their own.

It was not so with the other foreign writers in our neighbourhood whom I have mentioned before. They were not concerned, or perhaps informed, whether the Picts were in those times distinctly known or not; but not being struck with the impression which their universal disappearance made upon the Scots, and being unconcerned in the false honour of a total extirpation, they delivered with simplicity such accounts as they found of the Picts in their more ancient historians, which Caradock¹ and the author² of the appendix of Nennius among the Welch, and Tigernack³ as well as the Ulster annals among the Irish, had perused. And what is further remarkable in the two last (to wit, Tigernack's chronicle and the Ulster annals, two of the most authorized pieces among the Irish writers), they are both most particular in their accounts of the succession and reigns of the kings of the Scots, both before and after their union with the Picts (and Tigernack wrote in the eleventh age, before the name of the Picts was out of use), and yet neither of them give so much as any insinuation of the pretended extirpation of the Picts, but quite the contrary; for in the same manner as, since King James the Sixth's accession to the throne of England, he and his successors have been called frequently, by foreign or English writers, kings of England, from the more numerous and powerful kingdom; by others, kings of Great Britain, from the two kingdoms united; so the Ulster annals and Tigernack, who call all King Keneth's predecessors simply kings of Scots, or of Dalredia, change the style insensibly after Keneth's accession to the Pictish throne. And some of them, as the Ulster annals and the appendix to Nennius, call Keneth and his successors kings of the Picts, from the more numerous and powerful people; others, as Tigernack, call them kings of Albany, from the United Kingdom.

But it is not only the silence of the Welch and Irish authors on the pretended extirpation of the Picts, and their continuing to mention the Picts after their union with the Scots as before, as a people still dwelling in Albany, that attest the Picts' continued subsisting after King Keneth's time; but we have no less clear proofs of the same matter from the Saxon or English historians or writers in every age down to the twelfth.

The most ancient of them, who lived near to the time of the union of the Picts and Scots, is Asserius Menevensis, who, though in his chronicle he gives an account of the transactions of those times, not only of what passed in Britain, but in France, yet he hath not one word of so remarkable an event as

¹ Usher, *Antiq.* p. 375.

² Lynch, *Cambren.* Evers.

³ Usher, *ibid.*

the extirpation of the Picts, which he could not have omitted had there been any such thing, they having been one of the most ancient and powerful nations in Britain, especially having mentioned them on much less occasions. But as a demonstration that he was far from thinking them extinct in Keneth's time, he¹ speaks of them by name, A.D. 875, as being, with other people of the island, harassed by the Danes. Moreover, the Saxon chronicle² and Ethelwerd,³ two of the most ancient Saxon writers after Asserius, as they are entirely silent on the pretended extinction of the Picts, so they both mention them as a people still subsisting in Albany, upon occasion of that irruption of the Danes, A.D. 875. And thus much for the ninth age, in which the union was made.

That the Picts were still subsisting in the tenth age, and made a part of the subjects of the kings of Albany or Scotland, we have plain proof from the same Ethelwerd in his chronicle,⁴ A.D. 937, and more particularly from Ingulfus,⁵ his contemporary, who both relate that the Picts made a part of the army of Constantine, king of Albany, at the battle of Brunford, against Adelstan, king of the Saxons. In the eleventh age we have accounts of the Picts, still known by their own name, in the laws attributed to William the Conqueror, and published by Selden in his notes upon Eadmer.⁶ But as that copy of the Conqueror's laws is of little or no authority, we have a certain account of the Picts still remaining inhabitants at least of Galloway and other parts of the west of Scotland, and yet known by their own name, in the eleventh and twelfth ages, and this from a letter of Radulf,⁷ archbishop of Canterbury, to Pope Callixtus, about the year 1122. In fine, Richard Prior of Hexham,⁸ in the twelfth age, informs us, as an eye-witness, of the Picts making part of King David I.'s army, A.D. 1137, at the battle of the Standard, and calls them, nine different times, by their own proper name of Picts; but it is remarkable that this author, who lived in the time and in the neighbourhood, informs us that the Picts were then commonly called Galweyenses.

From this expression we learn two very important things concerning the Picts: 1st. That it was about this time that the name of the Picts began to be eclipsed; and soon after, we find Huntington telling us, they were heard of no more than if they

¹ Asser. Chron. p. 165, edit. Gale. ² Chron. Saxon. p. 83, edit. Gibson.

³ Ethelwerd, fol. 481.

⁴ Ibid. fol. 483.

⁵ Ingulf. p. 37, edit. an. 1684.

⁶ Eadmer, p. 190.

⁷ Scriptor. Angl. col. 1746, n. 30.

⁸ Ric. Hagulstaden. apud X. Scriptor. Angl. col. 1322, l. 24, 34; col. 316, n. 34; col. 317, l. 10; col. 318, n. 14, 24, 44; col. 319, n. 51; col. 291, n. 60.

'Picti qui vulgo Galweyenses dicuntur.'—*Ibid.* col. 316, n. 34.

never had been. 2d. Though the name came to be disused, yet the people themselves of the Pictish race still subsisted under the name of Galweyenses, from the province where they dwelt; and so it probably happened in other provinces of Scotland, such as Moravia, Murray, whence the Picts of these parts have been called Moravienses, as those in Galloway were called Galweyenses; and perhaps, from the Picts in Murray being so called, may have taken rise that tradition mentioned by some writers¹ of the Murray men (Moravienses),—their coming into Albany at first, under one Rodricus,² and giving origin to, as some say,³ or rather joining, the Picts in ancient times. And it seems the race of Picts in Murray, after their name was grown out of use, continued still there under the name of the province; and the frequent rebellions and disturbances which the Moravienses gave to our kings Alexander I., David I., and Malcolm IV., seem to confirm that they lived not easily under the government of our Scotish kings, and affected, as well as those of Galloway, a kind of independency, till at last King Malcolm IV.⁴ was obliged to transplant the inhabitants of Murray (Moravienses), and disperse them into different parts of the kingdom, and plant Murray with new inhabitants, about the year of our Lord 1159. By this it appears that the leading men of the Picts who survived their last battles and defeats given them by Keneth, retired⁵ partly to Galloway, partly to Murray, as to the two extremities of the kingdom, and were not so easily brought to submit to the Scotish government as the commonalty throughout the country.

But it is to be remarked, in the first place, that Galloway (Galweya) was of much larger extent in ancient times, and even in the twelfth age, than it is of late, and that Galloway and Louthian included all those provinces of Scotland that lie to the south of the Friths of Clyde and Forth. The laws of *Regiam Majestatem*⁶ seem to be a plain proof of this. And by charters of King David I.⁶ it appears that Galloway in those times included, besides the country now called Galloway, those of Carick, Kyle, Cunningham, as also that of Renfrew, as may be collected from a Bull of Pope Alexander III.,⁷ and so, perhaps, a part of Clydesdale. It appears, also, that in those ancient times Galloway was looked upon as distinct from Scotia (Scotland), and consequently had its laws and customs distinct by

¹ Boeth. lib. 4, fol. 54, 55, 56, n. 38.

² Usher, p. 303.

³ Math. Westm. ad. an. 75, p. 55.

⁴ Chron. Paslat. ms. Biblioth. Regiae Lond. lib. 8, c. 6.

⁵ ‘Omnis illi qui ultra Forth manserint in Laudonia, Galwidia vel aliis locis, respondebant calumniatoribus de Scotia.’—*Reg. Maj.* lib. 1, c. 17, n. 8. Ibid. c. 20, n. 10.

⁶ Chart. vet. Glasg. fol. 2, Ch. David.

⁷ In Cartul. eod.

itself, as is manifest by many of our ancient laws and Acts of Parliament.¹

On the other hand, it is certain that the Picts, as they were longer distinguished in Galloway by their own name (as we have seen), so they made, since their union with the Scots, a greater figure in Galloway than anywhere else in Scotland that we know of. And, first, it appears by Malmesbury² that the Picts (and he joins the Scots with them) invaded that country some time before their union, upon the decay of the Bernician kingdom; the *Polychronicon*³ says they were the Picts only that seized on Galloway, and took it from the Saxons. In the twelfth age, the monk Joceline,⁴ who lived in the neighbourhood, in *The Life of St Mungo*, calls Galloway the country of the Picts; and the Picts, being the inhabitants of Galloway, became so famous that in the beginning of the twelfth age,⁵ Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, calls the bishop of Galloway (*Candidæ Casæ*) the bishop of the Picts.

By all this it appears—1st. That on Keneth's taking possession of the Pictish kingdom, those of the Picts that stood out against his title retired in a body chiefly to Galloway, and there fortified themselves, till, being forced to submit to the Scots, they retained still some of their liberties, and had not only peculiar laws and customs, but proper princes of their own, though depending on the crown of Scotland, as it appears that Galloway had Fergus, Uchtred, Rolland, and Alan, among whose daughters it was divided. And it is remarkable that our kings, in ancient times, in the address of their charters,⁶ mentioned the Galweyenses by their own name (when they were concerned), distinct from the Scots and their other subjects.

From what hath been said before, it appears, in the second place, that a great many of the inhabitants of Galloway were originally Picts, not only of the commonalty, as in other provinces anciently possessed by the Picts, but even of the best and greatest families; since, as we have seen, there is no doubt to be made but many of the leading men among the Picts, who survived Keneth's victories, retired to Galloway. And if I were not afraid of being thought too great an adversary to

¹ Reg. Majest. lib. 1, c. 17; Stat. Alex. II., cc. 2, 17; Quon. Attachiam., cc. 72, 78; Stat. Rob. I. c. 14.

² Malmesbur. fol. 155, n. 5.

³ ‘Sedes Candidæ Casæ . . . depopulatione Pictorum a ditione Anglorum omnino (defecit).’—*Polychr.* p. 207.

⁴ ‘Pictorum Patria—quæ modo Galwedia dicitur.’—*Joc. in vit. S. Kentegerni ap. Bolland.* n. 34.

⁵ Epist. Radulf. Cant. ad Callist. Pap. x. script. col., 1746.

⁶ Chartul. vet. Glasg., Chart. Dav. I. fol. 2; Malec. IV. fol. 3, 52; Willelm, fol. 4, 52.

popular traditions, on which alone I find our modern writers ground their opinion of the descent of the male race of the royal line of the Stuarts from the Scots-Irish line, I should be apt to think that there is a much greater probability of their being descended of the Picts, or ancient Britains, whose progeny, as well as that of the Scots, and some remains of the Saxons, were the inhabitants of Galloway in its old extent, including all these western countries on the south side of Clyde. Since that ancient family of the Stuarts, from the first time we have any account of it on assured records, was seated in these parts, as is clear, as well by the chartulary of Paslay as by a Bull of Pope Alexander III.,¹ A.D. 1179, addressed to the proprietors of Galloway (Galwellan), among whom Alan, son to Walter, is reckoned one of the chief. And a proof that the Stuarts are not descended from the Scots-Irish is, that never any of the families bore, in ancient times, any Scots-Irish name, as all our kings of the Scots-Irish line did, till Malcolm Keanmore's children, and some others afterwards,—as Donald, Malcolm, Duncan, &c.,—but the common names of all the first we know of the race of the Stuarts were Alan and Walter,—names, neither in those times nor at any time before, ever in use among the Scots that came from Ireland.

But let that be as it will, it is certain that both the Picts and (as we have made appear elsewhere) the ancient Britains were the inhabitants of these parts; and we have a proof of it from the address of some charters² of several of our kings to their subjects of the diocese of Glasgo (as has been remarked), where, besides the Scots, the English (who were the remains of the Saxons), and the Franci, who were some Norman families lately come in, the Galwejenses, who were the Picts, as we have seen, and the Walenses, Welch, or Britains, are distinctly named. This mixture of so many several different nations who possessed that country occasioned, about the eleventh age and beginning of the twelfth, that barbarity, or almost extinction of Christianity, among the inhabitants, which is described by the author of the preface of the old chartulary of Glasgo,³ written about 500 years ago, where he mentions the ancient inhabitants of the diocese of Glasgo, which he calls *Cumbrensis regio*. Jocelin calls it *Cambrensis*; and the author of *St. Elred's Life*,⁴ speaking of Galloway, gives much the same character of the inhabitants. And though there is no doubt but the expressions of these writers are somewhat hyperbolical, yet

¹ Chartul. Glasg.

² Vet. Chartul. Glasg. fol. 52, 4.

³ ‘. . . dispari gente & dissimili lingua & vario more viventes . . . gentilitatem potius quam fidei cultum tenuerunt.’—Vet. Chart. Gl. fol. 1, 2.

⁴ Vit. S. Elredi ms. bibl. Coton. Tiberius E. 1.

the mixture of so many different nations could not but have dismal effects upon their moral conduct. To remedy these evils, our ancient religious kings found no means more proper than the restoring the Episcopal Sees of Glasgo and Galloway, which, it appears, had been long without bishops; and the erecting, in several places of these countries,—as their great men (among others, Walter, son of Alan, predecessor of our kings) did by their example,—abbeyes or monasteries of the most strict and esteemed religious men in those times, by which means, and by the good laws and polity which our kings instituted, those countries became, by degrees, the most religious and most polished in the kingdom.

But to conclude this account of the Picts, I hope, by all we have shown in the foregoing articles, among other things, it hath appeared to the impartial reader that the Picts are the progeny of the Caledonians, and by consequence of the first, the most ancient and most valiant inhabitants of Britain; that their dominions far exceeded those of the Scots, as did also the number and strength of their nation; that their government was hereditary and monarchical; and, in fine, that not only the total extinction of the Picts by King Keneth is false and fabulous, but that the royal family and present inhabitants of Scotland are in general as well the descendants and progeny of the ancient Caledonians or Picts, as they are of those Scots that came in from Ireland, and have as good a title to the actions, religious or military, performed in ancient times by the one as by the other. And this alone suffices to demonstrate the antiquity, as well of the royal line as of the generality of the inhabitants of Albany or Scotland; so we are under no kind of necessity to have recourse to the Scots, who came from Ireland, for maintaining either the antiquity of the royal line of our kings beyond any monarchy now in being, or the ancient settlement of the inhabitants in Britain.

B O O K I I.

OF THE SCOTS.

Introduction and Division of this Second Book.

AFTER having put the ancient state of the Roman, British, and Pictish inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain in the best light I could in the foregoing book, it remains now in course to treat of the Scots, a subject so much more important than the former in that it is properly the end and scope of this whole undertaking. The Britains and Picts, as all other ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of this island, having by degrees been incorporated and cemented by conquest, alliances, and length of time, as we have shown, into one people with the Scots, all the inhabitants, of whatever origin, have been known these many ages by no other name; and all the northern parts of Britain, united in one kingdom, have been also known only by the name of Scotland.

But it must be acknowledged that no part of the history of Britain is more intricate, involved in greater difficulties, and more liable to debates, than what concerns the Scots. All is here contested; the origin of the Scots, the time of their coming first to Ireland, their first settlement in Britain, the antiquity of their monarchy there, its ancient extent, the number and even the names of their ancient kings, as they are set down by their modern historians, much more their lives and actions,—nay, the very name of Scots makes alone the subject of a considerable debate.

It is chiefly within these two last ages that all these questions have been more warmly agitated; and some of the best pens of the three nations, Scots, English, and Irish, have been designedly employed about settling them, besides what other foreign writers have said upon the subject. So that it would seem, that whoever would by choice undertake this subject again, can scarce avoid the character either of being troublesome to the public, if he barely repeats what others have said, or that of rash and

presumptuous, if he should pretend, after so many great authors, to put matters in a better light.

What I have to say for this undertaking is, that it is a consequence, and indeed the very end, of my having already treated of the Roman, British, and Pictish ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of the island, and that the whole was none of my own choice, those kind of debates having always appeared to me a very invidious task; but being prevailed on to set down my thoughts on the subject, I resolved to write impartially what I conceived most conformable to truth, without regard to the many prejudices of the generality, either of my own, or of any other country concerned.

To give the reader, therefore, a general prospect of the method which I design to follow in this second book concerning the Scots, the most material question to be examined is to determine the time of their first settlement, and the beginning of their monarchy in Britain. All the rest of the history of the Scots depends on that, and must take a quite different turn according as that question is resolved. Now, it being generally agreed that the Scots of Britain are the offspring of the Scots in Ireland, nothing can be determined with certainty concerning the time of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain, or the beginning of the monarchy, till that of the Scots in Ireland be first examined. For if the Scots were settled in Ireland 1200 or 1300 years before the incarnation, as the modern Irish writers pretend, the first settlement of the Scots in Britain might be with equal probability (as we shall show) placed before the times of the incarnation, as the modern Scottish writers assert it. But if, on the other hand, the settlement of the Scots in Ireland ought to be placed no earlier than in or about the times of the incarnation, the epoch of their settlement in Britain must necessarily be in proportion abated. From whence it follows that we must make a different judgment of the remote or high antiquities of the Scots in Britain, according as those of the Irish are supposed to be certain, dubious, or fabulous.

This being supposed, I shall, in consequence hereof, divide this book concerning the Scots into two parts or sections. In the first, before I enter into the examination of the high or remote antiquities of Ireland, I shall suppose them such as the modern Irish writers describe, to wit, that the Scots of the Milesian race were settled in Ireland above one thousand years before the incarnation; that Herimon, their first king, came from Spain, and reigned in Ireland in the eleventh, twelfth, some say thirteenth, century before the birth of Christ; that from this Herimon there continued in Ireland an uninterrupted succession of kings of the Scotish-Milesian race, with learning,

laws, and other marks of a polite nation, during about 1500 or 1600 years, down till St. Patrick's time, who preached the gospel in Ireland in the fifth age ; and this is what I mean, throughout all this book, by the terms of high or remote antiquities of the Irish, which I am obliged frequently to make use of for brevity, and to avoid repetitions of the same thing. Upon supposition of the probability or certainty of these high antiquities of Ireland, I shall, in this first section or part of this book, consider the high antiquities of the Scots (by which I understand all along the opinion of those who maintain that the Scots were settled in Britain, and had a succession of kings, from before the times of the incarnation, down till Fergus, son of Erch) ; and after I have examined in general the probability of the ancient settlement and monarchy of the Scots in Britain upon this supposition, I shall enter into a full discussion of the famous debate concerning the truth of the story of the forty Scottish kings before Fergus, son of Erch, as it is set down by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers.

In the second section of this book I shall begin by examining the grounds of the high antiquities of Ireland, and the time of the settlement of the Scots in that island, that being a necessary preliminary to the discussion of the high antiquities of the Scots in Britain, with which I shall conclude, after having premised a short account in general of the writers of the Scotish history, and particularly of some historical pieces (relative to the subject of which I am treating), and which either have not hitherto been published, or have not been taken notice of by our modern writers.

SEC. I.—*Of the Antiquity of the Settlement and Monarchy of the Scots in Britain, upon Supposition of the Certainty or Probability of the high Antiquities of Ireland. Together with a full Discussion of the story of the forty ancient Kings before Fergus, son of Erch.*

Before I enter into the examination of the high antiquities of the Irish or Scots, which is to make the second section of this second book, in this first section, that I may with more freedom, and less offence to my own countrymen, be allowed to inquire into the certainty of the high antiquities of the Scots in Britain, and to set down what I think most conformable to truth, I shall endeavour in the first chapter to show that the present inhabitants of Scotland ought to be very indifferent about these high antiquities ; and that the Irish, in order to support their own high antiquities, are more interested to maintain those of the Scots than are the present Scots themselves.

In the second chapter, that I may not seem to have neglected the common opinion of the writers of our history for these three or four last ages, and to do all the justice I can to the abettors of the Scottish high antiquities, I shall endeavour to make it appear that the Scots had as probable grounds to go upon for maintaining their early settlement in Britain, as the Irish can give in proportion for the early settlement or high antiquities of the Scots in Ireland ; so that those Irish writers who maintain the settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland twelve or thirteen ages before the incarnation, have nothing with which they can justly reproach the Scottish writers for placing the settlement of the Scots in Britain before the Romans entered it.

In the third chapter (which will take up the greatest part of this first section), on the same supposition of the Scottish high antiquities, or of their early settlement and ancient monarchy in Britain, I shall inquire at full length (as the importance of the subject requires) into the various accounts given by our historians of the forty or forty-five Scottish kings preceding Fergus, son of Erch, or King Fergus the Second.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE DEBATES OF THE SCOTISH AND IRISH WRITERS ABOUT THE ANTIQUITY OF THE SETTLEMENT OF THE SCOTS IN BRITAIN ; THAT THE PRESENT INHABITANTS OF SCOTLAND OUGHT TO BE VERY INDIFFERENT ABOUT THE ISSUE OF THESE DEBATES ; AND THAT THE IRISH ARE MORE INTERESTED TO MAINTAIN THE ANCIENT SETTLEMENT OF THE SCOTS IN BRITAIN THAN THE SCOTS THEMSELVES.

There has been now for about two centuries the warmest debates betwixt the Scottish and Irish writers concerning the antiquity and settlement of the Scots in Britain. Both agree that the Scots came thither immediately from Ireland, at least as to the generality of them ; but the modern Scottish writers assert, and that with such concern as if the honour of the nation did in a great measure depend upon it, that their coming from Ireland, and the beginning of their monarchy in Britain, were before the incarnation. The modern Irish writers, with no less warmth, deny this ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, and affirm that the Scots came from Ireland no sooner than the fourth or fifth century of Christianity ; and that the monarchy

of the Scots in Britain began only in the beginning of the sixth century.

After so long and so fierce a paper war, carried on with so much eagerness on both sides, it would, no doubt, appear at first a very strange paradox to pretend that it is a matter entirely indifferent to the true honour of the present Scots, whether the Scots that came from Ireland were settled in Britain before the incarnation, or only after it; and that the Irish, and they alone, have a real interest, for the support of their remote antiquities, that the settlement of the Scots in Britain could be proved to have been before the incarnation.

And yet as odd as this paradox seems at first, I hope it will appear much less surprising if matters be impartially considered. And first, as to the present Scots. The chief reason of their maintaining, with so much concern, the antiquity of their settlement and monarchy in Britain in the Scotish line is, that their modern historians ground their chief title to the most ancient monarchy of Europe, as well as their claim to all the warlike actions performed by the ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain against the Romans and provincial Britains, wholly upon their descent from these Scots that came from Ireland. Now if it can be made appear—1st. That the present inhabitants of Scotland, both as to the commonalty, the nobility, and as to the royal family, either are not universally descended from those Scots that came from Ireland, or owe not chiefly to them what makes for their greatest lustre and honour in ancient times; 2d. That the present Scots derive a title to these warlike achievements, performed against the Romans and Britains, independently of their descent from these Scots that came from Ireland,—it will follow that the present Scots ought certainly to be very indifferent about the time when the Scotish colony came from Ireland to Britain, whether before or after the incarnation.

1st. As to the commonalty. That the bulk of the nation is not the offspring of the Scots who came from Ireland appears from this, that, as it hath been already shown, many of the inhabitants both of the north and south are descended of the Piets; many of the inhabitants of Clydesdale, and of other parts of the west, are come of the ancient Britains; many of those of the south are descendants of the Saxons, of whom, besides those that were settled here of old, many others retired hither for refuge, and were received by our King Malcolm III., upon the invasion of the Normans. Many of the Normans themselves were received afterwards in Scotland, and got lands and possessions by the name of Franks from our kings, the immediate successors of Malcolm III., as appears by the chartularies of our abbeys. Many of the inhabitants of Catness, Ross, and some of the isles,

are descended from the Danes. The inhabitants of Murray are supposed by Boece¹ himself to be of a different extraction both from the Picts and Scots.

2d. As to the nobility and gentry, it is no less certain that many of the best and most ancient families are not descended from the Scots who came from Ireland; for besides the remains of the Britains and Picts, a great many of the best families had their origin from foreign countries, as appears by their traditions and wrists; by the account, as far as it may be depended upon, that Boece² himself and his followers give of those who came in from England, France, and Hungary, about King Malcolm the III.'s time; by the more certain testimony of the English historians³ of the great numbers of the Saxon nobility that fled to Scotland from the oppression of William the Conqueror and his successors; and by the surnames of many Normans, to whom our kings, successors to Malcolm the III., gave lands in Scotland, as it is clear by many ancient charters, and chiefly by the donors and witnesses in the chartularies of our monasteries.

3d. As for the royal family of Scotland, by what hath been already said of its descent from the Picts,⁴ I hope that it has been made appear that our kings, as they lineally descend of the Pictish kings, according to the Scottish historians, so they possess, in the right of these ancient kings, the far greatest part of the kingdom, and that they are no otherwise descended of the Scotish line which came from Ireland, than they are of the Bruces and Stuarts. So that as the placing the first king of the race of Bruce and of Stuart in the fourteenth century only, doth not derogate from the antiquity of the royal line or monarchy of Scotland, because the succession is carried up in the Scotish race in the same royal blood from which the Bruces and Stuarts, by marriages, had their right; so the placing the first king of the Scotish race in the fifth or sixth century doth not prejudice the antiquity of the royal line or monarchy, since it is carried up time out of mind long before, in the race of the Pictish kings, from whom, by marriage as well as by conquest, the Scotish kings had the right to the much greater part of Albany or Scotland.

So I hope it will appear to any that will examine the history of the royal family of Scotland without prejudice, that the length or antiquity of the race in the Scotish line which came from Ireland is of as little consequence to it as is the antiquity of it in the line of Bruce that came from Normandy, or in that of the Stuarts, which I conceive may be more probably derived

¹ Boeth. lib. 12, fol. 56, edit. 1.

² Ibid. lib. 12, fol. 258, edit. 2.

³ 'Tota nobilitas Angliae transivit ad reges Scotie.'—*Math. Paris*, p. 4.

⁴ *Sopra*, p. 93.

from a Pictish, British, or Norman original, than from a Scottish-Irish; so that the chief interest that our royal family hath, as to its antiquity, is in its descent from the ancient race of the Pictish kings, from whom, as to the far greatest part of Albany, the right came by an heiress to the Scots, as the right to the whole equally came by other heiresses from the Scots to the Bruces and Stuarts.

This being supposed, and also granting that the settlement of the Scots and their monarchy in Britain in the Scottish-Irish line (which shall be examined) were of no older date than the fifth or sixth age, the royal family of our kings in the Pictish line, and the antiquity of their monarchy in Albany, will thereby be at no loss, but will subsist with more honour to the nation, and by more certain proofs from history, even with the allowance of the Irish themselves, from what they esteem their most authorized ancient writers, than it can do in the Scottish-Irish line, as we have shown.

And as to that kind of honour and reputation which depends upon valour and warlike actions, those of the Caledonians, whom we have shown to be the same people called afterwards Picts, are grounded upon the sure foundation of the best of the Roman histories, which cannot be equally said of the Scots, and near three centuries before the name of the Scots was heard of in any ancient author.¹ I have already treated of the exploits of the Caledonians in the Roman times, and shall have occasion to set them down more at large in the second part of this essay.

But to fix the settlement of the Scots in Britain two or three hundred years after the incarnation, would not only not derogate from the honour of the present inhabitants of Scotland, or of their monarchy, as I have shown, but it would seem rather a derogation from both were it fixed before that time. For if we suppose, with the modern Scottish writers, that the Scots came from Ireland to Britain, and that their monarchy began in the west of Scotland, above three hundred years before the incarnation, then it will follow that for the space of about seven hundred years these Scots remained confined to a little corner of what since composes the kingdom of Scotland, in an indolent, obscure, dispirited, and unknown condition, without either extending their narrow territories, or making any considerable effort to do it; since during all those ages, and till about the middle of the fourth age after the incarnation, their name is not so much as once found in history, whilst that of the Caledonians or Picts was so renowned in the best histories of the times. And that after so long a settlement in Britain we find the Scots, even in the sixth age, still confined to the western coasts and

¹ *Supra*, p. 44.

islands, their first habitation, without being able to extend their bounds on any side during 900 years; or if they did, they had been forced back to them again. Since it hath been already shown from good authority, that in the sixth age, and beyond it, the Picts¹ were still peaceable possessors of all the north of Scotland, from the Orkneys southwards to the Forth, and beyond it on one side of them; and that on the other some of the Picts, with the Britains and Saxons, were in possession of the countries to the south of the Cluyd.

Whereas, if we should suppose that the Scots came to Britain only about the third century of Christianity, and that their monarchy began only in the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth age; that at the first appearance they make in Britain we find them joined with the Picts, assaulting the Roman empire; that from that first appearance the Roman and British histories never mention them but as a warlike and stirring people, jealous of their own liberty, and still active to extend their conquests on their neighbours,—all these and such like considerations, supported by good authority, seem to give a much more noble impression of the Scots as a martial people, from their first entry into Britain, than to suppose that they were settled seven hundred years before, and lay all that time in an entire obscurity, confined to a corner of the island.

So, upon the whole, we may now conclude that it is a matter at least very indifferent to the present inhabitants of Scotland whether the coming in of the Scots from Ireland to Britain was before the incarnation, or in the third century after it.

On the other hand, as to the Irish, it is just the contrary; it is their interest alone to maintain the settlement of the Scots in Britain before the time of the incarnation, and to raise it, therefore, above all others, in order to support their own high antiquities, and the ancient series of their kings; for the basis and foundation of all their high antiquities being the settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland many ages before the incarnation, whatever serves to prove this ancient settlement is of importance to them. Now nothing could prove this ancient settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland so directly as the showing that they had been able, three or four ages before Christianity, to send forth such a considerable colony as that of the Scots in Britain is represented to have been in those early times by the Scotish modern writers; whereas the Irish, by taking this support away from their antiquities, and by bringing down the coming of the Scots to Britain to the fourth or fifth century of Christianity, leave the whole fabric of the antiquity of the settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland in a

¹ V. Picts, art. 5, secs. 1, 2, *supra*.

tottering condition, having nothing for the support thereof but uncertain traditions, and the fabulous rhymes of their bards or seanachies, which we shall have occasion to examine afterwards.

So I leave it to anybody to judge whether the Irish are not more interested to maintain that the Scots were settled in Britain before the incarnation, than the present Scots are themselves; and at the same time whether it be likely that the Irish, who without doubt have had, since they received Christianity in the fifth age, the use of letters, learning, and writers among them, could either have omitted to take notice of and record so considerable a transaction as that of the Scots coming from Ireland, and setting up a new kingdom in Britain in the fifth or sixth age, or could continue to this day, both against their interest and knowledge, to maintain so positively and unanimously that the monarchy of the Scots in Britain is no older than the fifth or sixth age, if they had not good proofs for it.

But at least it follows, from what we have shown concerning the Scots in the foregoing observations, that one may, without the least disparagement of the present inhabitants of Scotland, very freely and impartially discuss the truth of what their modern writers have advanced concerning their high antiquities, and follow what shall appear (all things considered) most conformable to true history and ancient authority concerning the time of the settlement of the Scots, and beginning of their monarchy in Britain.

CHAPTER II.

THAT IF THE SETTLEMENT OF THE MILESIAN SCOTS IN IRELAND, TWELVE OR THIRTEEN AGES BEFORE THE INCARNATION, BE ONCE ADMITTED, THAT OF THE SCOTS IN BRITAIN, BEFORE THE ROMANS ENTERED IT, WILL FOLLOW IN COURSE, AS BEING SUPPORTED BY PROOFS OF THE SAME NATURE.

After having shown, in the foregoing chapter, that the Irish, in order to support their own high antiquities, seem to have greater interest than the present Scots to maintain the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, to omit nothing that may give light into the Scottish antiquities, and that I may not seem to have slighted or neglected the common opinion of the writers of the Scottish history during these three or four last centuries, and to do all the justice I can to the assertors of the Scottish

high antiquities,—supposing here, as I do all along in this section, the truth or probability of the ancient settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland, as the Irish writers will have it,—I shall endeavour to show, that upon that supposition there is at least as great probability of the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain before the Romans entered it; so that those Irish writers that maintain the opinion of the Milesian Scots settling in Ireland about 1200 years before the incarnation, have no just ground to reproach the Scots with adhering to their opinions in favour of their ancient settlement in Britain, before the Romans' first entry into it, since they may be as probably sustained as those of the Irish.

I do not here pretend that there can be settled any fixed dates or epochs of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain, or indeed of any northern nation before they had the use of letters, either from Christianity or from the Romans entering among them. The ignorance in which, I suppose, all the northern nations were, in those early times, of all means or methods to calculate and regulate dates of past transactions, render, in my opinion, all their pretensions to any fixed chronology absolutely groundless; and their want of the use of letters made it no less impossible for them to preserve any accounts of particular circumstantial facts. All that a rude and illiterate people, with the help of their ignorant venal bards, could retain, was some uncertain series of genealogies, with some general traditions of more remarkable adventures of the nation, mixed with fables,—all which their posterity, after the use of letters was introduced among them, might have reduced into some rude form of historical narration, applying dates to it by conjecture.

Neither do I propose to treat in this chapter of the first government of the Scots in Britain, of the real antiquity of their monarchy, and of the certainty of their kings before Fergus, son of Erch; that being a subject important enough to deserve to be discussed apart, I shall therefore reserve it for the following chapter. At present, I propose to treat only in general of the ancient settlement of the Scots, and that only on the supposition of the truth of the Irish high antiquities; and to show that there appears as great probability, from authority, of the Scots being settled in Britain before the Romans first entered it, or at least in the first ages of Christianity, as of their being settled in Ireland ten or twelve centuries, or indeed at any time, before the incarnation.

The authorities that the modern Irish writers commonly allege for the Milesian Scots being settled in Ireland so many ages before the birth of Christ, may be reduced to two classes. 1st. Those drawn from such pretended mss., ancient annals, or

writers in the Irish tongue, as hitherto they have never thought fit to publish, either in their own language, or in a complete and faithful translation. 2d. Those taken from such writers or pieces of antiquity, whether domestic or foreign, as are published whole and entire, so as the public may be able to form a judgment of their authority, truth, and weight, and of the passages quoted from them, with relation to the character and age of the author, or credit of his work.

1st. As to the much-boasted ancient annals or writers of the history of Ireland, not as yet printed, we shall have occasion to examine their credit, when we come to treat of the time of the settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland. All I shall say here is, that no proof of any weight can be brought from those pretended ancient writers as long as they lie in the dark, because no judgment can be made of their authority or credit by some short passages said to be taken from them; nor, indeed, any account at all made of them, till they be first published whole and entire, with faithful translations, and with an account where the originals are to be met with. This is a work that certainly deserves the attention and labour of some of their learned and best skilled in the Irish language. This would be incomparably more for the honour of the Irish nation, if these ancient pieces answered the characters they have given of them, than all that they have written of them in modern pieces, grounded only upon quotations most part at second hand, copying from one another.

2d. As to the authorities drawn from such writers or pieces of antiquity, whether domestic or foreign, that are already published, relating to the antiquities of the Scots, either in Ireland or in Britain, it will be found upon examination that they will make at least as much for the high antiquities of the Scots as for those of the Irish. To begin with domestic writers, John Fordun's is the first general history extant in print that gives an account of the Scotish high antiquities; and though he wrote only in the fourteenth century, yet there is no general history of the Irish extant that we can hear of, printed or ms., that comes so near the times in which the beginning of the Milesian Scotish monarchy in Ireland is placed by them, as Fordun does to the age in which he places the first Scotish king in Britain.

Psaltair Cashel is, by all I can learn, the most ancient general history of Ireland extant. The author, Cormac Culinan,¹ king of Munster and bishop of Cashel, was killed in battle in the beginning of the tenth age, that is, about 2200 years after the time that the beginning of the monarchy of the Milesian Scotish race in Ireland is placed; whereas, though John Fordun

¹ Waræus de Scriptor. Hybern. pp. 47, 48.

lived but in the fourteenth century, yet even that was within 1600 years of the time he places the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in Britain. So he wrote at least 600 years nearer the beginning of the transactions he accounts for than the most ancient now extant even of the unprinted Irish historians. And if *Psaltair Cashel* quotes some poets or bards more ancient, so also John Fordun quotes *Chronica* and *alia Chronica*, and several legends; all which are like to prove as credible vouchers as the book with the white cover, or that of immigrations or conquests, which they say are cited by *Psaltair Cashel*.

It is true, Fordun was only a priest, and not a king or bishop as Cormac. But what helps Cormac might have procured to his work by authority, Fordun supplied by his application, labours, and diligence, having travelled over Scotland, England, and Ireland to collect materials for his history. And as for judgment and decernment betwixt true and false, I suppose there is nothing in the most fabulous part of Fordun that matches the stories of Cain's three daughters and Noah's niece coming to Ireland, and many such other rare stories as are said to be contained in *Psaltair Cashel*; but we shall be more able to make out the comparison when this royal history is as fairly published as Fordun's is in two editions. In the meantime, what may be wanting to Fordun's authority may be made up by that of the estates of Scotland, who may well enough balance that of a king of Munster. We have, in many copies of Fordun's continuators, the Scottish memorials¹ and letters, in the beginning of the fourteenth age, authorized by the whole kingdom, to the Popes Boniface VIII. and John XXII., in which they assert the settlement of the Scots in Britain several ages before the birth of Christ.

In the thirteenth age the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, some ages before the incarnation, is also attested by a short Scotish chronicle in Latin verse,² commonly bound in with some MSS. of the *Scotiechronicons*, of which we shall treat afterwards. And thus we see the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots in Britain witnessed by our own country writers, whereof I have met with none as yet that touch upon this point more ancient than this thirteenth age. But we shall find foreign writers give testimony to it much farther back.

Such, in the eleventh age, is Ethelwerdus the Saxon writer,³ who tells us that in the first age of Christianity the Emperor Claudius, who never went farther than Britain, met with resistance and opposition from the Scots and Picts in his design to

¹ Fordun, edit. Hearn. pp. 835, 883.

² In the Appendix, n. 6.

³ 'Resistunt jugo Scotti Pietique.'—*Ethel. Hist. Angl.* fol. 43. Ibid. fol. 474.

conquer that island ; and again, that the Scots and Picts made inroads on the provincial Britains in the Emperor Severus' time. Not to insist on the Saxon chronicle¹ (written at latest in the eleventh or twelfth age), which supposes the Scots were in Britain in Julius Cæsar's time, when he says that Cæsar, returning from Britain to France, left his legions among the Scots. This, to be sure, is a mistake, being a false translation of Bede's words, *Legiones in hyberna dimisit*, by the author of the Saxon chronicle ; but it shows that this Saxon writer believed the Scots were in Britain in Julius Cæsar's time.

In the beginning of the eleventh age, or at the end of the tenth, the *Life of St. Cadroe* was written, and was published by F. Colgan, in his collection of Irish saints, in folio ; and again, by F. Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum ord. S. Bened.* t. 1 ; but he retrenches the preface as superfluous. In this preface, which Colgan's edition contains, there is some account of the Irish antiquities, to which both Colgan himself and Flaherty refer for a proof of them. The author of that life gives this account of the origin of the Scots. He says they were called Chorisci, from Coria ; but Scotti, and their country Scotia, from Scota, an Egyptian, wife to Netus or Niulus, their leader, who was son to Æneas, a Lacedemonian. After many pilgrimages, he gives them an ancient settlement in Ireland, without determining the time of their coming thither ; and adds that, from thence,² after some years, they came over the British Sea to the island Jona, and afterwards possessed the country of Ross and the towns of Rigmone and Bellochor, and that many years after that they received the Christian faith by St. Patrick. Whence it follows that the preaching of St. Patrick in Ireland was long after the settlement of the Scots in Britain, in which Jona and Rossia are situated, as are also the towns of Rigmone and Bellochor ; whereof the first can be no other than the ancient Rigmonth or Rigmond, called since St. Andrews, the metropolitan church of Scotland ; and Bellochor is mentioned by an ancient writer³ as a royal seat of the Scotish kings, where he says that King Donald, brother to Keneth the Great, died *in palatio suo Bellochor*. But without entering here into the discussion of the truth of this narrative, it is clear that at the same time that the author attests the Scots' ancient settlement in Ireland, he gives a full testimony of their early settlement in Britain, very long before St. Patrick's time.

In the ninth century, Nennius, a Britain, wrote his *Eulogium*

¹ 'He ȝopleȝt hiȝ heþe abyðan mis Scoȝtum.'—*Chron. Sax.* p. 2.

² 'Fluxerunt quot anni & mare sibi proximum transfretantes Eviam ins. quæ nunc Jona dr., &c.'—*Colg. vit. SS.*, t. 1, p. 494.

³ Append. n. 3.

Britanniae, which, in most of the ms. copies, is attributed to Gildas, and contains a very confused and uncertain account of the British and Irish antiquities. However, it is the most ancient monument we have in print of both their origins, and was published by Dr. Gale, A.D. 1691. This author, after giving some account¹ of the origin of the Britains, of their settlement in the island, next brings in the Picts,² who, he says, were still subsisting in Britain, A.D. 832, when he wrote; and last of all, *novissime omnium*,³ he says, the Scots came to Ireland from Spain, and so gives a brief account of the planting of Ireland, very different from what the modern Irish tell us. However, if his authority be good as to the ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland, it ought not to be questioned in what he relates of the time of the Scots first coming to Dalrieta, which, according to the Irish⁴ and other writers, was the ancient name of the kingdom or habitation of the Scots in Britain.

Nennius⁵ tells us, then, that the Scots came to Ireland 1002 years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea; that the Scots came to the country of Dalrieta (*ad regiones Dalrietæ*) in the time that Brutus reigned—or rather, was consul—among the Romans, from whom the consuls began, &c. Thus he makes a distinction betwixt the Scots coming to Ireland and their settling in Dalrieta, and assigns different dates to each of these settlements, which plainly shows that Dalrieta was a different country from Ireland, and so no other than the *Regnum Dalrietæ* in Britain; and accordingly Nennius had placed Dalrieta expressly in Britain a little before, where he says that Istoreth, son to Istorinus, took possession of Dalrieta, in Britain (*in Britannia Istoreth filius Istorini tenuit Dalrietam cum suis*⁶). The same Nennius, in the tenth chapter, makes a distinction betwixt the Scyths or Scots that came to Ireland, and the Scyths or Scots that dwelt in the north in his time, in the ninth age, and who, jointly with the Picts, had made war on the Britains long before the Roman monarchy. ‘Seythæ autem,⁷ i.e. Scotti in quarta mundi aetate (that is, from King David to the Babylonish captivity), obtinuerunt Hyberniam: Scythæ autem qui sunt in occidente & Picti de Aquilone pugnabant unanimiter & uno impetu contra Britones. Et post multum intervallum temporis Romani monarchiam totius mundi obtinuerunt.’ Again, for a further proof that these Scots that unanimously with the Picts made war on the Britains were not a people of Ireland, but inhabitants of Britain, Nennius⁸ tells us that Severus, the emperor, made his famous wall from sea to sea,

¹ Nennius, cc. 2, 3, 4.

² Ibid. c. 5.

³ Ibid. cc. 6, 7, 8, 9.

⁴ Usher, Antiq. Brit. p. 320.

⁵ Nennius, c. 9.

⁶ Ibid. c. 8.

⁷ Ibid. c. 10.

⁸ Ibid. c. 19.

betwixt the Britains on one side and the Picts and Scots on the other, adding still the same reason, because the Scots from the west, and Picts from the north, used unanimously to insult the Britains. And thus we see that the most ancient writer we hear of for the Irish high antiquities, gives equal testimony to the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, for Nennius lived in the age before King Cormac, author of *Psaltair Cashel*.

In the eighth age, Bede¹ may be brought as a witness of the Scots' ancient settlement in Ireland. Bede supposeth, indeed, that the Scots were settled in Ireland before the incarnation, since he says that the Picts found them there, who, according to his account, came to Britain before the Romans first entered it; but then, besides that, Bede hath not a word of the Scots being settled in Ireland ten or twelve centuries before the incarnation, or of their descent from Milesius, or of their ancient monarchy, or, indeed, anything that can attest their high antiquity. Besides all this, if Bede's authority may be depended upon as to the remote antiquities of Ireland and of the north of Britain, the coming of the Scots to Britain before the Romans entered it may be made no less clear by Bede's own words,² where, giving account of the order in which the five nations that had inhabited Britain came first into it, and whose languages still subsisted there as yet in Bede's time,—to wit, the English or Saxons, the British, the Scotish, Pictish, and Latin or Romans,—he places the Britains first, *imprimis Britones solum*; the Picts in the second rank; and after these two he places the Scots, the third nation that came in,—‘Procedente autem tempore Britannia post Britones & Pictos Tertiam Scotorum Nationem recepit;’ and then, after giving a short account of Ireland whence the Scots came, and of their first habitation in Britain, he ranks the coming in of the Romans to Britain, under Julius Cæsar,³ in the fourth place, and after the Scots,—‘Verum eadem Britannia Romanis usque ad Cajum Julium Cæsarem inaccessa atque incognita fuit;’—as if he had said, Britain was first inhabited by the Britains; the Picts came into it in the next place; after them came the Scots, in the third place; but the Romans came not in till Julius Cæsar's time, about the year 593 of Rome, and sixty years before the incarnation. In fine, Bede places the coming in of the Saxons, A.D. 449, the last of all the five nations that had a settlement, at any time before Bede, in Britain, and whose language still subsisted in that island.

Thus we see a kind of continued tradition for the Scots' ancient settlement in Britain, carried up from age to age, till the seventh or eighth century; not to insist upon the testi-

¹ Bede, lib. 1, c. 1.

² Ibid. lib. 1, c. 1.

³ Ibid. lib. 1, c. 2.

mony of Sidonius Appollinaris, who wrote in the fifth age, and supposes that the Scots were in Britain in Julius Cæsar's time, and that he fought against them,

‘ . . . Victricia Cæsar
Signa Caledonios transvexit ad usque Britannos,
Fuderit & quanquam Scotum, & cum Saxone Pictum.’

Now, though all those authorities I have quoted may seem, and that deservedly, to the learned critics of this age, but very inconsiderable proofs of transactions passed so long before the authors lived ; yet, if compared with those the Irish can bring for the ancient settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland, those I have brought for the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain have a double advantage over them. 1st. Those I have quoted for the Scots are all taken from authors already printed, and whose authority hath passed the test of the public ; 2d. The latest of them (John Fordun) lived nearer the times he accounts for—to wit, the beginning of the Scotish monarchy (as he places it) in Britain—by five or six hundred years, than Cormac, author of the *Psaltair Cashel*, the most ancient general history that the Irish allege, lived in regard of the Milesian Scotish monarchy in Ireland, of which he is said to give an account, and far higher—even up to the deluge, and before it. Besides that, the two most ancient that can be alleged—Bede and Nennius—prove as much for the high antiquities of the Scots as they do for the Irish ; and so do most of the rest whom the Irish bring to attest their high antiquities.

To conclude, though it must be owned that neither the Irish, for the ancient settlement of the Milesian Scots in Ireland twelve or thirteen ages before the incarnation, nor the Scots, for their settlement in Britain before the Romans entered it, can give any such proofs of their pretensions as can satisfy the learned of the present age ; yet I hope, by what hath been said in this chapter, it will appear to unprejudiced readers that the Scots have as much to say for their high antiquities as the Irish have in proportion to say for theirs, since all the authorities the Irish bring from authors already printed, and received by the public, for their high antiquities, prove equally those of the Scots. So that those of the Irish writers that will persist to maintain the opinion of the Milesian Scots' settlement in Ireland twelve or thirteen centuries before the incarnation, can have no just cause to reproach the Scotish writers, who place the settlement of the Scots in Britain before the Romans (under Julius Cæsar) came first into it.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE SCOTS IN BRITAIN, UPON SUPPOSITION OF THEIR ANCIENT SETTLEMENT. DISCUSSION OF THE VARIOUS ACCOUNTS OF THE SCOTTISH HISTORIANS CONCERNING THE GOVERNMENT AND KINGS OF THE SCOTS IN BRITAIN BEFORE KING FERGUS, THE SON OF ERCH.

Having shown in the foregoing chapter that, on supposition of the ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland, there is no less probability of their settlement in Britain before the incarnation, it remains now to examine, upon the same supposition, the nature of the government of the Scots in Britain in those early times, and to inquire into the truth of the various accounts given by our historians of the kings preceding Fergus, son of Erch, commonly called Fergus the Second.

That the government of the Scots in Britain (supposing their ancient settlement there) was from the beginning monarchical, seems to follow in course. They are supposed to have come in from Ireland, where, according to all the Irish writers, monarchical government, and that alone, was in use from all antiquity, and not the least insinuation in any of their writers of any other form. So the Scots, at whatever time they came to Britain, could set up no other besides that, especially considering there was no other form of government fitted for a rude multitude, particularly in an invasion, and in making a new settlement, but that of being governed by a single person, who, either by birth, valour, wisdom, or conduct, had credit with and an ascendant over the rest, who found ways to manage them and keep order among them, and who had more skill and experience to lead them on against their enemies. Such an unpolished multitude as the Scots must have been at their first coming to Britain, were, no doubt, ignorant of all republican schemes, and must needs, when they came to make a separate state by themselves, distinct from the Picts, have had a common leader or captain to head them in their encounters with, and in the opposition they would meet with from, the ancient inhabitants, before they were able to make fixed habitations; and the success of their enterprise would apparently engage them to entail the government on this leader and his family.

Accordingly, John Fordun, and after him all our other historians, agree in general that the Scots in Britain were from the beginning governed by kings; that Fergus, son of Feradac or Ferchard, was the first, and they place his reign 330 years before the incarnation; that from this Fergus downwards to a

second Fergus, the son of Erch, the Scots had a constant succession of kings in Britain during the space of about 700 years; but as to the genealogy or lineal descent, the names, the number, the lives and actions of the kings before Fergus, son of Erch, the rights of monarchy of the Scotish kings in general, there is a great difference betwixt the accounts of the first and latest of our Scotish historians.

These accounts given by them of the kings before Fergus the Second (whom they all place about the beginning of the fifth age of Christianity) may be all reduced to two classes—1st. That of Fordun, and of all our monastery books, his transcribers or continuators; 2d. That of Hector Boece and his followers, among whom Buchanan deserves the chief attention, as being in greater vogue at home and abroad than any of the rest.

ART. I.—*Of the account given by John Fordun and his followers concerning the Kings of the Scots in Britain before the reign of Fergus (called the Second), son of Erch.*

John Fordun, a priest of the diocese of St. Andrews,¹ chaplain of the church of Aberdeen, lived in the time of the Kings Robert the Second and the Third, being contemporary with Cardinal Walter Wardlaw, bishop of Glasgow, who died A.D. 1386. He compiled the history of the Scots in five books, from the beginning till the death of King David the First, A.D. 1153, and left some collections towards a continuation; all which were published, A.D. 1722, with great fidelity and exactness by the learned Mr. Hearne, who embellished his edition with a curious search of all that concerns Fordun's history, to which I refer the reader, and shall only observe that this chronicle of Fordun was continued down by Walter Bower, abbot of Inch-Colm [*Aemoniae insulae*], and other writers of the fifteenth age, till the death of King James I., A.D. 1437; and the whole work, composed of J. Fordun's five books and of the continuation of the history by different hands till the aforesaid year 1437, is commonly known by the title of *Scotichronicon*.

The occasion of John Fordun's writing the Scotish history, and the pains he was at in collecting materials for it, are described by one of his continuators, not long after his time, in the preface to the chronicle of Couper,² where we are told that during the debate betwixt John Baliol and Robert Bruce about the right of succession to the crown of Scotland, King Edward I. of England (known by the surname of Longshanks), having got himself chosen umpire in that debate, under pretence of

¹ Liber Paslat. in bibl. reg. London.

² Praef. libri ms. B. M. de Cupro infra.

composing those differences, and of regulating the succession according to the precedents of former reigns, and conformable to the ancient laws and usages of Scotland, caused all the libraries of that kingdom to be searched, and gathered up all the ancient histories of the Scotish nation, as he did also all the public records, charters, and writs containing its rights and privileges. All these, I say, King Edward caused to be gathered up, A.D. 1291, under pretence of examining by them the right of the competitors, having also in his view to search into them for proofs of his pretended superiority over Scotland. And when he had got into his hands all that could be found of them, he carried up some of them to England, and caused all the rest to be burnt and destroyed. ‘Aliquantas secum & ad Angliam abstulit, reliquas vero flammis incinerandas despicabiliter commisit,’ says the author of the preface to the Couper chronicle. And by this Scotland remained destitute of historians, and the natives in great ignorance of past transactions.

Besides the authority of the chronicle of Couper and others, set down afterwards at length, we have too visible proofs of the destruction of our ancient histories and records, some ten years after this havoc made of them, in the famous debate¹ betwixt the Scots and this King Edward I., A.D. 1301, before Pope Boniface VIII. concerning the independency of the crown of Scotland, where both the instructions which the prelates, barons, and consuls of Scotland (as they are called) gave to their deputies at the court of Rome, and the memorial drawn up by Baldred Bisset, the principal of these deputies, for maintaining the rights of the nation, as well as the letter of the Scotish nobility, A.D. 1320, to Pope John XXII.;—all these pieces contain such evident marks of a general ignorance of the ancient history and state of Scotland, and lean so much on conjectures and uncertain popular traditions, that seemed to make for the cause under debate, but absolutely irreconcilable with all the remains we have of the true state of the northern parts of Britain in ancient times, that this alone might suffice to prove that the Scots at that time were generally destitute of all ancient monuments of true history.

And this general ignorance of our ancient history continued down till John Fordun compiled the Scotish chronicle in a new form, that suited best with the taste of the times in which he wrote. In order to that, says the author of the aforesaid preface, Fordun spared neither labour nor diligence to restore the history of his country; and for that end travelled over all Scotland, searching everywhere the libraries, churches, monasteries, colleges, universities, and towns, gathering together whatever

¹ Fordun, edit. Hearn. pp. 835, 883.

remains he could meet with to his purpose ; discoursing also with learned men versed in history ; nay, not content with that, he travelled also, says my author, into England and Ireland upon the same search, setting down carefully the informations he received as materials for what he intended. Thus furnished, he returned home, and set to work. And upon all he had collected within and without the kingdom, he framed to himself a new system of a chronicle of Scotland, in five books, beginning at the height of antiquity, and continued down to the death of King David I., A.D. 1153. But before we proceed further, it is necessary to give an account of this laborious work of Fordun in the proper words of the author of this preface to the chronicle of Couper, who, living in Fordun's time, or very near it, may be depended on as furnishing the best account we have of Fordun's labours on our history.

As to the barbarous style of this preface, I hope the beginning of the fifteenth age, when this writer lived, before the restoration of learning, and of the purity of the Latin tongue, may be a sufficient apology for the style of this, and other such pieces of these times.

'*Secundum¹ veteres sanctiones, laudabilis antiquitas patribus & priscis observata, non solum approbanda a modernis esse dignoscitur, sed & imitanda. Eumvero nonnulli ante nostra tempora, luculenter satis inclytorum & validorum Scotorum gesta, veridico satis stylo & memorabiles chronicas scriptis reliquerunt. Quae quasi omnia sua saltem ante tempora membranis commendata, ille truculentus tortor Edwardus III.² post ultimum conquestum, rex Angliae dictus Langschankis, & tyranus, postquam suboriri coepit dissentionis materia inter praeclentes principes Broysos, viz. & Balliolos, super juris pocioritate succedendi in regnum, violenter abstulit & delevit. Attendens ipse proptera regnum divisum, & per praesens³ verisimiliter desolandum, finxit se velle tractare quae pacis erant, tanquam amicabilis compositor, & amicus inter partes, sub ovili vellere collecta sibi callide ejusdem regni Scociae procerum una parte, & sic sibi reliqua resistere non valente, ejusdem sibi regni de facto usurpavit custodiam, & oppressionem. At ipse statim occasione, ut prætendebat, cognoscendi, quis eorum per vetustorum grammatum indagationem, pleniorum in regno vindicare poterat facultatem, rimatis regni cunctis librariis, & ad manus ejus receptis autenticis & antiquatis historiarum chronicis, aliquantas secundum & ad Angliam abstulit, reliquas vero flammis incinerandas despicibiliter commisit.*

'Post quarum quidem chronicarum amissionem, inter paucos

¹ Prefat. chronicæ B. Mariae de Cupro ms. penes D. Ricard. Hay.

² Sic.

³ Forte partes.'

alios ad recollendum perdebat, exurgens quidem venerabilis presbyter Johannes Fordun, Scotus nomine, ad fortia manum misit, & patrio zelo titillatus efferbuit, nec tamen ab inceptis destitit, donec laboriosis studiis, tam Angliā, quam aliis circumvicinis provinciis peragratis, tanta illinc & in propria, de amissis recollegit, quoadusque quinque librorum volumina, de delectabilibus gestis Scotorum, sicut apud Scotichronicon in magno interseruntur, chronicaliter satis compegit. In hoc laudanda est hominis industria. Attendens ipse, quod non hominis sed numinis proprium esse convincitur, cuncta memoriæ commendare, idecirco & ipse pedester, tanquam apis argumentosa, in prato Britanniae, & in oraculis Hyberniæ, per civitates & oppida, per universitates & collegie, per ecclesias & cenobia, inter historicos conversans & inter chronographos perendinans, libros eorum annales contrectans, & cum eis sapienter conferens & disputans, ac tabulis suis dipticiis quæ sibi placuit intitulans, tali fatigabili investigatione, quod non novit invenit, atque in sinuali suo codice, tamquam in alveario inventa, quasi mellifluos favos, accuratè concessit : & ipsa, ut præmisi, in quinque libros, usque ad mortem sanctissimi regis David filii¹ sanctæ Margarete, eleganter intitulavit, &c.

By this it is evident that the Scots had formerly good, ancient, and authentic chronicles and annals, as well as other nations ; we see the occasion of the loss of them, and John Fordun's indefatigable labours to find materials for a new body of history. But, after all his travels, his materials for the Scotish history, especially in the most ancient times, were still very lame, and would have made no great figure if set down alone ; therefore, to remedy this, and make something like a body of history, Fordun was forced, where he wants other materials, to run out upon the general history of Europe, civil or ecclesiastical ; besides that the succession of the emperors, and such other chief transactions, were in a great measure necessary for connecting the few particulars Fordun had recovered of the Scots with a fixed order of chronology, as he hath done all over his history.

Accordingly, to reduce it to a regular method, he divides it into five books, each of which contains a particular period or age of the Scotish history, and begins with a remarkable era. The first book contains, in his account, about 1175 years, from Gathelus, his leaving Egypt in Moses' time, A.M. 3689 (according to Fordun's account), to the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in Britain, under Fergus, son of Ferchard, A.M. 4864. This book, besides foreign matters, contains the first origin of the Scots, as was then believed, from Geythelos or Gathelus, son to Neolus, a king of Greece ; his going to Egypt, where he

¹ ' Filium ' ms.

espoused Scota, daughter to Pharao, in Moses' time ; upon the Egyptians being drowned in the Red Sea, Gathelus left Egypt, and went to Spain, from whence the Scots sent thrice to Ireland,—1st. Hyber, son to Geythel. 2d. Micelius or Milesius' sons, Eremon and Partholan ; but, according to Fordun, Eremon returned to Spain, and succeeded his father. 3d. Simon Breac, who carried with him the fatal stone, and settled in Ireland. From Ireland the Scots spread themselves, first, into some isles of Britain ; that of Rothsay was so called from Rothay or Rothsay, who passed over among the first Scots to that island. Others of the Scots came over gradually and settled in Britain ; and Fergus, son of Ferchar or Feradac, came over about 330 years before the incarnation, and made himself the first king of the Scots in Britain.

Fordun's second book contains the Scotish history, from the setting up the monarchy by Fergus, son of Ferchar, anno 330 before the birth of Christ, during the space of 733 years, till another famous era, whereof we have the first account from Fordun, to wit, the restoration of the Scotish monarchy in Britain, A.D. 403, according to Fordun's account, by King Fergus II., about forty years after that kingdom had been ruined by Maximus the usurper.

The third book contains the history of the Scots from Fergus II., son of Erch, A.D. 403, during the space of 428 years, till the reign of King Alpin, father to King Keneth, who united the Pictish and Scotish kingdoms.

The fourth book contains the history from King Alpin, and the famous epoch of the union of the Pictish kingdom with that of the Scots, during the space of about 236 years, till the reign of Malcolm Keanmore.

The fifth book of Fordun's chronicle begins with the reign of Malcolm Keanmore, A.D. 1056, and contains the history of 96 years, till the death of King David I., A.D. 1153.

So we have from Fordun the form, at least, of a continued history or chronicle of the Scots, from the highest antiquity till the twelfth age and downwards. And indeed, if it be considered what a sad condition our history was in when Fordun undertook it, it must be acknowledged that it required a great labour, and no small capacity and knowledge, for these times, to have brought it into the regular form and method in which he hath left it. This chronicle was in so great esteem in those days, that all our monasteries and other churches, which had been deprived of their ancient history in King Edward I.'s time, as well as the rest of the kingdom, did so universally adopt Fordun's chronicle as the standard of our history, that it bore, in after ages, the general name of *Scotichronicon*; and each

monastery, making only a few inconsiderable additions to it, and continuing it down, gave it its name; hence it was called *Liber Paslatensis, Sconanus, de Cupro, &c.*, after the names of the several monasteries which adopted, transcribed, and continued it.

Thus far as to Fordun's chronicles in general. We are now to consider the accounts he gives of the kings, of the government, and monarchy of the Scots in the times preceding the reign of King Fergus son of Erch, or Fergus II. In his first book, as we said before, after the vulgar stories of the Scots under Geythelos or Gathelus and his posterity, their coming from Greece to Egypt, from thence to Spain, from Spain to Ireland, and from that to Britain, he gives the following account of the beginning of the Scottish monarchy in Britain, and of the origin of the regal and legislative power among them. That the first Scots came over by degrees from Ireland to Britain; that being a confused, headless multitude, without laws or government, and exposed to the oppression of the Picts,¹ Fergus, son of Ferchard, of the ancient race of the Scottish kings of Ireland, a brave prince, carried over with him to Britain a gallant troop of young men, and gathering together the Scots that had hitherto lived up and down among the Picts, and uniting them into one people with those he brought along with him, and settling them on the western coasts, and in the islands of Britain, he made himself the first king over them (*super eos Regem primum sc constituit*), and thus he founded the monarchy,² making laws and statutes for the government of his new kingdom, and settling the limits of it. And this, by the way, is the most ancient account that the Scots in Britain can bring, from history or record, of the first original of regal or legislative power among them.

6. From this Fergus, called the First, down to Fergus the Second, during the space of above 700 years, Fordun³ says there reigned forty-five kings over the Scots in Britain, of the same nation and kindred; and accordingly⁴ he gives the genealogical series or descent, in the direct line, from this Fergus I., son of Ferchard, down to Fergus II., son of Erch, which we shall set down afterwards at length. And it is the only ancient genealogy of these Scottish kings, which we find still the same in all writers of different ages and different countries; nor is there any other genealogy to be met with, till Hector Boece produced a new one, never heard of, that we can learn, before his time. But it is further to be remarked, that Fordun gives us this bare ancient genealogy, and no more; for he tells us neither the lives,

¹ Fordun, lib. 1, c. 34.

² Ibid. lib. 2, c. 12.

³ Ibid. lib. 3, c. 2.

⁴ Ibid. lib. 5, c. 50.

nor actions, nor times of the reigns, nor even so much as the distinct names of his forty-five kings, neither in his second book, where he proposes to treat designedly of them, nor anywhere else ; nor does he, in setting down the names from father to son, in the genealogy, inform us who of them were kings and who not. He only names as king, Rether or Reuther, the fifth in the genealogy from Fergus I., and says he was the same that Bede calls Reuda ; and one King Eugenius, whom he calls uncle to Erch, who was father to Fergus II. But as to all the other forty-five kings preceding this Fergus, Fordun owns ingenuously that for the present he could say nothing distinctly of their reigns, because he had not found any full account of them.¹ And in this state he left seven centuries of the Scotish history, being forced to fill up all those ages with extracts from the Roman, British, or general history, for want of materials of that of the Scotish, notwithstanding his so laborious and diligent searches after them. But we shall have further occasion to speak of this chronicle of Fordun more than once hereafter, and to examine the credit and grounds particularly of this part of it that concerns the forty-five kings. What we have set down here is only in order to serve us in the discussion we are to make of the grounds and credit of the history, as it is delivered by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers, which we are to inquire into in the next articles.

7. The continuators or abbreviators of Fordun, during the fifteenth age, were many ; and those of the most learned of the Scotish nation of those times in what related to history, and who had the fairest occasion that any writers could have of access to all that remained of ancient monuments of the Scotish history : such were Walter Bower or Bowmaker, abbot of Inch-Colm, Patrick Russel, a Carthusian, the chronicle of Couper, and others still extant ; yet none of them, though they made additions to other parts of Fordun's history, have made any new discoveries as to the forty-five kings preceding Fergus II., nor any addition to the little that Fordun contains of these kings ; but all of them, after repeating over his lame account of them, conclude that whole period of these forty-five kings with Fordun's² own words : 'A primo quidem hujus regni rege Fergusio filio Ferchar ad hunc regem Fergusium filium Erch inclusivè quadraginta quinque reges ejusdem gentis & generis in hac insula regnaverunt. Sed & horum singillatim distinguere tempora principatum ad præsens omittimus : nam ad plenum scripta non reperimus.' Thus Fordun concludes all he had to say of the forty-five kings ; and thus after him, in proper terms, all his continuators repeat them. In a word, all of them agree

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, c. 2.

² Ibid. lib. 3, c. 2.

with Fordun, or rather barely copy after him, in the genealogy and number, and in the same silence of the distinct names, lives, and actions of these forty-five kings ; and all of them give the same reason of their silence, to wit, the want of a full account of them ; all of them give also the same original of the monarchy among the Scots in Britain. And this was all the light we had in that first epoch of our history, till A.D. 1526, that Hector Boece published his new discoveries, of which we are next to treat.

ART. II.—*Of Hector Boece, and his Account of the first Forty Kings of the Scots in Britain.*

SEC. I.—*Of Hector Boece, and his History in general.*

Hector Boece or Boethius, born in Dundee, studied in the University of Paris, and there commenced Master of Arts, A.D. 1494. He was contemporary with his countryman John Major, who also studied and taught with great reputation in that university. Boece, speaking of him and of some other divines that flourished there in his time, shows a singular respect for them. These men, says he,¹ I will ever have in veneration ; their doctrine I will always admire. Now it is to be remarked, that John Major and his disciple James Almain, writing about these times in defence of the doctrine of the Gallican church, concerning the superiority of general councils over the Pope, seem to have had no clear notion of the distinction of the ecclesiastical and civil powers, and venturing sometimes out of their own sphere, which was scholastic divinity, they drew very irregular consequences from the one of these powers to the other ; but these consequences, in regard of the civil powers, were afterwards solemnly disavowed and rejected by those² that maintained the same doctrine as to the ecclesiastical.

However, these dangerous notions seem to have had some influence on Boece, in the historical work which we are about to examine. He informs us that he was called away from Paris by Bishop Elphinston, before he had finished his studies. The occasion of that good bishop's inviting him, and as many other learned men in different faculties as he could draw to Aberdeen, was in order to assist him in forming the university he had newly founded at Old Aberdeen, his episcopal seat. Boece, upon his coming, was made canon of Aberdeen, and principal of the new college. He had been particularly acquainted at Paris with the famous Erasmus, and they kept afterwards a corres-

¹ Boeth. Vit. Episcop. Aberdon. fol. 27.

² Richerius vindic. doctrinæ majorum, p. 320, ed. Col. 4to.

pondence by letters. Among others of Erasmus' letters to Boece, there is one in which Erasmus gives him a catalogue of all he had published to that time.

In effect, Boece was one of the first in these northern parts who, by assiduous reading, and imitation of the ancient Latin authors, began to restore the Latin tongue to its purity, instead of that barbarous style which, from the fall of the Roman empire, had overrun all till later ages. This is easy to perceive in Boece's works, when compared with the other writers before or about his time. The first that he published was the lives of the bishops of Aberdeen, A.D. 1522. But what chiefly rendered him famous was the history of the Scots, whereof the first edition was printed at Paris by Badius Ascensius, A.D. 1526. Another edition, with a continuation by John Ferrerius, was published also at Paris, A.D. 1575. After the death of Bishop Elphinston, A.D. 1514, Boece continued in the same degree of credit under his successors, the Bishops William Stuart and Gawin Dunbar. But after much search at Aberdeen and elsewhere, I could nowhere find an account how long he survived the publishing his history, A.D. 1526. All I have met¹ with concerning him since that time is, that I found him witness to a charter of Bishop Gawin Dunbar, dated the fourteenth of December 1529, designed thus ['Test. Hectore Boetio sacrarum literarum professore, collegii Aberdon. primario'].

As to his history of the Scots, he informs us, in his dedication to James Beaton, archbishop of St. Andrews, and chancellor of Scotland, that his intention in writing the Scottish history, at the entreaty of his friends, was to put the brave actions of the Scots in a brighter light, and to excite the learned to read them, by writing them in a more accurate and elegant style of Latin; whereas the barbarous style of the former writers of our history had made it be neglected by the learned, and buried in oblivion. It appears, also, by the whole tract of his history, that his aim was to represent the monarchy of the Scots in Britain as one of the most ancient kingdoms; to remove from the ancient Scots the character of barbarous, and set them out in the earliest times as a polite, civilised people, that acted all by common councils and regular assemblies, whilst most other northern nations remained as yet uncultivated; to extol the valour of the Scots in ancient times, their battles against the Romans, and victories over them, in times that generally all other known nations were forced to be under their yoke.

But one of his chief views all through his history seems to have been, what he insinuates both in his epistle dedica-

¹ Cartul. Aberdon. in biblioth. jurid. Edinburg. fol. 158.

tory to the king and in that to the archbishop of St. Andrews, to set down patterns to the young King James the Fifth, during whose minority this history was penned, and to his successors, by the models which it presents of virtuous kings always attended with prosperity, and to frighten them from vice by the punishment and tragical ends of wicked princes, as well as to keep them in awe by the frequent examples he relates of their having been called to an account by their nobles, and punished by them for their mal-administration.

SEC. II.—*Of the Vouchers or Authoritics on which H. Boece's History is grounded.*

But the question I am here to examine is the truth of his relations and grounds of his history, and that depends in great measure on the credit of his vouchers, or monuments of ancient history, on which that of Boece is built. Those he mentions are the chronicle of Inch-Colm (*Insulae Æmoniae*), Bishop William Elphinston's history, that of Turgot, bishop of St. Andrews; but chiefly those of Veremundus, John Campbell, and of Cornelius Hybernicus. I suppose this last furnished Boece with accounts of the Scots before their coming from Ireland to Albany.

As to the chronicle of Inch-Colm (*Insulae Æmoniae*), written by Walter Bower, abbot of that monastery, who continued John Fordun, Doctor Gale had informed us that a copy of Fordun, which belonged formerly to Boece, was extant and in his possession, as it still remains in that of his son, Roger Gale, Esq., who was pleased to favour me with a sight of it. It is the same which, as I observed already, was published by Mr. Hearne, A.D. 1722. And there is a great appearance that all the real bottom that Boece—or rather, the compilers of his memoirs—had to go upon was the first five books of Fordun's history. How far he hath followed them will appear by what we have to say of his performance; but it is somewhat surprising that Boece never once mentions John Fordun's history by his own name, though we are assured that he had it in his possession.

William Elphinston, bishop of Aberdeen, died A.D. 1514. Boece says that this bishop wrote the history of Scotland, and he proposes to himself, above all others, to follow Elphinston in his history. There is, indeed, in the Bodleian Library a MS. history of Scotland, in a hand about Elphinston's time, which was given to that library by General Fairfax as being Bishop Elphinston's work. It is divided into eleven books, whereof

the first five are John Fordun's chronicle *verbatim*; the following six are of some one of John Fordun's continuators—whether Bishop Elphinston or another is uncertain. But if this were Bishop Elphinston's genuine work, which is not very likely, then we must suppose that Boece intended to impose upon his readers when he tells us that he chiefly imitated or followed Bishop Elphinston in his history. For this Bodleian MS. being, as to the first part, entirely Fordun's, it is absolutely different from the memoirs that Boece hath followed, since it hath nothing but a few lines of the forty first kings, as we have seen, and entirely differs from Boece in the names and order of the royal descent, or genealogy of the kings, from Fergus I. till Fergus II., as well as in the calculation of years.

And we have another proof from a very certain work of Bishop Elphinston that he knew not, at least in the year 1509 (three or four years before he died), any other account of our history but that which Fordun had left. This is the *Breviary of Aberdeen*, according to the use or rite of the Church of Scotland, done by Bishop Elphinston, or by his care, and printed by his order at Edinburgh, the aforesaid year 1509, whilst he was bishop of Aberdeen. Now in this breviary, where he relates the first planting of Christianity in Scotland, there is not one word of King Donald, whom Boece makes our first Christian king; and in the legend of St. Palladius,¹ under King Eugenius, the author keeps close to Fordun's chronology, very different from that of Boece.

The next voucher of Boece for his history is Turgot, bishop of St. Andrews. Now all we have heard hitherto for certain of the Scotish history from Turgot's pen, is the *Life of S. Margaret, queen of Scotland*, which is often quoted by Fordun and others, and still remains. And why might not his *History of Scotland* have been seen also by others besides Boece, and still remained to posterity, if he had truly written such a history? At least Fordun, who frequently quotes Turgot's *Life of Queen Margaret*, could not have failed to have also quoted his *History of Scotland*, if he had found it; and in his diligent searches through Scotland and England, of all the monuments of the Scotish history, he could not have missed, I think, to have met with that of Turgot, had there been any such extant in his time.

Thus we see the whole weight of the credit of Boece's history, especially of the reigns of the first forty kings,—and, indeed, of all that it contains of these ancient times, over and above what we meet with in Fordun,—is at last resolved into the authority of Veremundus and of John Campbell; and he gives us this account how he came by them.

¹ 6 July.

That he had them from Ycolmkill, which, says he, from the days of King Fergus II. had been appointed by him for the depositary of public records on this occasion. That this king,¹ during his exile, had assisted Alaric at the sacking of Rome, A.D. 409, and that, whilst others carried off gold and silver, Fergus had chosen for his share of the plunder a chest of books, which he carried off with him, and, after his restoration, placed it in Ycolmkill; ordering that island to be thenceforth the depositary of all public monuments of history, and especially of the Scotish annals, and appointing keepers to take care of them. That, when King Edward I. destroyed or carried off all our public records and monuments of history, those of Ycolmkill escaped; and that from this island Boece had the works of Veremundus and John Campbell, with other ancient pieces of history, sent him to Aberdeen.

But to pass over here those exploits of Fergus II. and what is said of Ycolmkill, where the monastery was not founded till about 160 years after those times, I cannot but observe that there appears here some want of memory in Boece in what he says of the place appointed for the preservation of our annals and histories; for A.D. 1522, four years before he published his history, in his *Lives of the Bishops of Aberdeen*,² Boece had informed us that though Fergus II. had indeed appointed at first Ycolmkill for the keeping the monuments of our history, yet, long after, King Alexander I., considering the distance of Ycolmkill, and the difficult access to it, had caused our annals and other monuments of history to be removed from that island, and transported to Restennoth, in Angus. So we were to look no more for anything of that kind from Ycolmkill. At least it appears by this that Boece knew nothing (A.D. 1522) of Veremund or his other famed records of Ycolmkill, and accordingly he tells us³ that they were sent to him only in the year 1525. And yet, by the beginning of the next year, 1526, his whole history (a large volume in folio), grounded chiefly on these records, was finished. Since his epistle dedicatory to King James V.—which is commonly the last thing an author puts his hand to—is dated April 1, A.D. 1526, and the volume itself came out in print at Paris that very same year, this was a wonderful diligence, not to call it precipitation, in a work that, for its difficulty and the obscurity of these ancient times, seemed to require much maturity and discussion, and, for its

¹ Boet. hist. prefat. ad Jacob. v. fol. 3; and Histor. Scot. fol. 114.

² 'Inde [ex *Jona insula*] sed multos post annos ut Restennothii (munitio est in Angusia, ubi nunc canonicorum D. Augustini cœnobium) quod ad Jonam difficilis admodum erat aditus, nostri annales inde traducti reservarentur, Alexander primus rex edixit.'—Boeth. prefat. ad *Vitas Epis. Aberd.* fol. 1.

³ Boet. hist. fol. 114.

importance, to deserve them. This, with the apparent contradictions above mentioned, concerning the place whence he brings his records, is certainly no good omen in the beginning of the history which we are to examine, and would make one apt to conjecture that Boece found the body of his history done to his hand by somebody that had not a mind to appear, and that he had nothing to do but give it his own turn, style, and order.

However that be, before I enter upon the discussion of Boece's history, and the vouchers he brings for it, I cannot but do him that justice to think that he had assuredly, when he published his history, copies of histories or memoirs bearing the names of Veremund, Corn. Hybernicus, and of John Campbell, and that he believed these were transcripts of ancient historical monuments of Ycolmkill. For, whatever may be thought of Boece's credulity, or even his inclination to invent and magnify what relates to his country at the expense of truth, it seems simply incredible that he could have, in his epistle dedicatory to the king, published over the kingdom so notorious facts, if there had not been books or writings sent him, bearing the names of Veremundus, John Campbell, &c.; but there is no means left to free him in like manner from want of discernment of ancient writings, and also from simplicity and too great credulity in taking on trust whatever writings or memoirs were given him as taken from ancient histories or records, or even from a great inclination to enlarge on the inventions of others, if he was not himself capable to invent.

For I think it may be clearly made out to any that are conversant in what assured monuments remain of the ancient state and history of Britain, that the writings and memorials that passed under the name of Veremund in Boece's time—the same thing I say of John Campbell, and the other vouchers of Boece's history of the first forty kings, and all it contains of those times over and above what is to be found in John Fordun—are but late inventions about Boece's own time; and so the whole fabric of his story of the forty kings, which he built upon the authority of those vouchers, is without any solid foundation, and, it is probable, was only intended to serve a turn.

SEC. III.—*Proof First against the Vouchers of Boece's History. The Silence of all former Writers.*

The first proof of the writings or histories attributed to Veremundus and John Campbell—their not being the genuine works of authors of the eleventh, twelfth, or thirteenth age, as Boece supposes, but inventions of later times—is that they had

never been heard of before Boece, though greater inquiry had been made after pieces of that nature by former writers than Boece either did or could make.

About 130 years before Boece wrote, John Fordun, as we have seen,¹ in order to restore the Scotish history, destroyed by King Edward I., travelled over all Scotland, searching all churches, monasteries, libraries, colleges, &c., for monuments or records of the ancient history of Scotland. Nay, his zeal for that good work carried him to travel through England and Ireland upon the same search, taking informations from all persons of learning, or that were versed in history, and sparing neither labour nor expense. Now, if Ycolmkill was so well known, as Boece and our modern historians will have it, for the place chiefly appointed in past ages for preserving our annals, records, and histories, can it be imagined that John Fordun, in all his travels through Scotland, England, and Ireland, in all his searches through churches and monasteries for historical records, would have omitted to search the monastery of Ycolmkill alone, where he might be sure to find more records of Scotish history than in all the rest together?

And if he went to Ycolmkill upon such a design, having copied out and made his collections in every place where he came, would he have omitted to take notice of such ancient, so full and particular accounts of the history of the kings before Fergus II. as Boece says that Veremund and Campbell contained? And if he had found the history of the first forty kings so fully and so distinctly set down as it is by Boece from Veremund and Campbell, would he have deliberately told us, as he does, that he had passed over these kings because he had found no distinct or full account of them in writing? especially since the accounts that Fordun gives of the reigns of our kings, from Fergus II. till near Malcolm Keanmore, which appear so lame to us, seemed full enough to Fordun to be distinctly set down.

Again, since Fordun sets down the series or succession of the Pictish kings, though he had no more than their bare names and the years of their reigns, would he have omitted to have given us at least the series, with the names and years of the reigns of the first forty or forty-five kings, if he had anywhere met even with that? especially if it be observed that in all appearance one of the chief motives of Fordun's travels and searches was to find out materials for the history of these first forty, or, as he calls them, forty-five kings, he being the first that we know of who makes mention of them. Since, then, Fordun could find no account of the actions nor years of the reigns, nor even of the distinct names of these ancient forty-

¹ Praef. Chron. Cupren., *supra*, p. 125.

five kings, nor anything but the bare genealogy, and gives us only the names of three of them, though he travelled so far, took so much pains, made such diligent searches everywhere for whatever could give any light into the Scottish antiquities, though he had the greatest and most learned of our countrymen of that age to assist him, such as Cardinal Wardlaw and others, what credit can be given to the new discoveries, never heard of before, made by Boece, who never travelled a foot, that we hear of, out of his college of Aberdeen to look after them ?

The continuators of John Fordun's history do furnish us with another unanswerable proof that those particular accounts of the first forty kings, which Boece says he met with in Veremund and his vouchers, were not extant either in Ycolmkill or anywhere else in Scotland in the age preceding Boece. There are still remaining many copies of Fordun, with continuations of his history done by different hands. The chief authors were Walter Bower or Bowmaker, abbot of Inch-Colm ; Patrick Russel, a Carthusian monk of Perth ; the chronicle of Couper ; the continuation of Fordun, attributed to Bishop Elphinston, in the Bodleian Library, and many others.

All these were written in the fifteenth age, or in the time betwixt Fordun and Boece, by the best historians that Scotland then afforded, and unquestionably well qualified for searching into and finding out what remained of ancient ms. histories anywhere hidden within the kingdom, especially in abbeys and other monasteries, they being all either abbots or the most learned churchmen or monks in their respective churches or monasteries, and having the best opportunity for writing, by their connection and correspondence with the other monasteries, churches, and learned men in the kingdom.

Besides that, the chief of them had in their view not only to continue down Fordun's history, but to enlarge upon what he had compiled, and to add to his chronicle what they could discover that was new concerning the antiquities of Scotland. So we see Abbot Bower, or the author of the *Scotichronicon, or Book of Paslay*, in the king's library at London, and in that of Edinburgh and elsewhere, intended, by distinguishing his own additions by the word *scriptor*, from Fordun's text by the word *auctor*. The same account of several additions made to Fordun by Macculloch, compiler of *The Chronicle of Scoon*, we have from David Buchanan.¹ Patrick Russel, a Carthusian, made also new additions, as it is remarked in the end of the ms. *Scotichronicon* in the possession of the Earl of Murray, and in the ms. chronicle itself in the lawyers' library at Edinburgh, entitled, *Liber Carthusianorum de Perth*. It is further to be

¹ Bishop Nicholson's Sc. Hist. Libr. p. 90, edit. 1.

remarked as to Abbot Bower, that, though he was not abbot of Ycolmkill, as some have called him by mistake, occasioned by the equivocal signification of the words *insulae S. Columbae*, but of Inch-Colm, in the Frith of Forth, yet it is probable he was in a more strict and particular union and correspondence with the monastery of Ycolmkill, by reason of both these monasteries being under St. Columba's protection as their common patron; and by consequence Bower would, without doubt, have a more free access to such ancient monuments as were in Ycolmkill than others.

Now, let me ask, what can be more improbable—in case there had been in those days such valuable monuments of history in Ycolmkill as Boece tells us there were—than that none of all those writers of the fifteenth age, men so well qualified and circumstanced to find out the ancient monuments of the Scottish history, so diligent searchers after them, in order to supply the imperfect account that Fordun had left of the succession of the kings from Fergus I. till Fergus II., that being what was most wanted in the history they all commented upon,—what can be more improbable than that none of these writers, no, not Bower, so united with Ycolmkill, should ever light upon Veremund, or any one of these pretended histories which Boece says were preserved in that abbey, nor upon any further account of the reigns, succession, or even names of the first forty kings, than what Fordun had set down? But all and every one of them conclude the lame account of the forty or forty-five kings before Fergus II. with these very words of Fordun:¹—‘A primo quidem hujus regni rege Fergusio filio Ferchar ad hunc regem filium Erch inclusivè quadraginta quinque reges ejusdem gentis & generis in hac insula regnaverunt; sed & horum singillatim distinguere tempora principatum ad præsens omittimus, nam ad plenum scripta non reperimus.’

This is, indeed, but a negative argument, but withal it seems to be of that force against Boece's new discoveries, that I cannot see what rationally can be opposed to it; for to say that Fordun and his continuators, who were so zealous to discover any help to the Scottish ancient history, should search everywhere else in Scotland and not have recourse to Ycolmkill, so famous over all the kingdom as being the most ancient monastery extant in Britain, and, according to Boece, the depositary of our ancient histories, is plainly against common sense; and it is no less incredible that, supposing they searched into that monastery, they should not make as great discoveries as Boece, who was never at the place.

Moreover, since it is acknowledged by all the Scottish writers,

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, c. 2.

and we have too sad proofs of it in the debates of the Scots against the English before P. Boniface VIII. (as hath been already shown),—since, I say, there is no doubt but generally all our ancient histories were destroyed or carried off in King Edward I.'s time, how could those in Ycolmkill escape the common fate, if it was so renowned for being the chief depositary of our annals and histories ? For it signifies nothing to say that, the monastery being so remote, it escaped the Englishmen's searches; for it was not the English by themselves that searched for all our histories, and brought them to Norham, A.D. 1291,—they were not as yet masters of Scotland ; it was the Scots themselves, in a common cause, that related to the settling the debated succession according to the use and custom of Scotland in former ages, that produced their ancient histories wherever they could discover them, to be inspected and examined by the chosen arbiters appointed to give their opinion in the cause depending betwixt Baliol and Bruce. So it being a general concern of all the Scotish nation, whatever annals or histories, whether in Ycolmkill or elsewhere, could serve to discover the former use and custom of the succession of the kings of Scotland were brought thither ; and being once on English ground, they never went home again, but were either destroyed or carried off, those of Ycolmkill with the rest.

So that when John Fordun set about the restoring our history, it does not appear that there was anywhere remaining, at least in Scotland, any entire annals or continued history of Scotland from the beginning; for the chronicle of Melross begins properly the Scotish history only at the marriage of Malcolm Keanmore and St. Margaret, A.D. 1067. What precedes that is the Saxon or English history, where Bede had left off; and the few passages concerning the Scotish kings, interspersed in that chronicle, are visibly of a posterior hand in the original ; besides, there is all the appearance that in King Edward I.'s time this chronicle of Melross was carried off to England with the rest. So that the best materials that John Fordun had to go upon, were the ancient genealogy, with the series of the names of the kings from Fergus the Second downwards, with the years of their reigns, extracted from our ancient chronicles inserted in some chartularies or other monastery books. Of these, and such other collections as Fordun found in his searches, with his own inferences from them, he composed his history, such as we have it, of our kings from Fergus the Second downwards. And for a further proof that we had no complete history remaining when Fordun wrote his chronicle, we need only observe, that all our most famous monasteries throughout the whole kingdom, such as Pasly, Scoon, Couper, etc., adopted

for the ancient history of the kingdom Fordun's five books as the only history of Scotland from the beginning till David I.'s death ; and that, with the additions to it, and continuations of it, made in the several monasteries of the kingdom, is originally what was afterwards called by the name of each monastery, *Liber Paslatensis*, *Liber Sconensis*, *de Cupro*, &c. And what confirms the matter, and is decisive upon this head, even the monastery of Ycolmkill itself adopted Fordun's chronicle, which is yet remaining in an ancient hand, by the title of *The Chronicle of Yeolmkill*, being recovered,¹ as I am informed, by the late Earl of Cromarty, and still in the possession of his son, or some of the family. Now those of Ycolmkill would never have adopted John Fordun's lame accounts for the proper chronicle of their monastery had they possessed such ancient annals as those of Veremund or John Campbell are pretended to have been ; or at least they would, in transcribing Fordun, have supplied from Veremund, &c., what was wanting in Fordun of the succession, lives, and reigns, or at least the names, of the first forty kings.

SEC. IV.—*Proof the Second against Boece's History. The most part of the names of his Forty Kings forged upon names of the old Genealogy, and a new Genealogy drawn up.*

A second proof of Boece's Veremund, and other vouchers for his history of his first forty kings, being a forgery and invention of later times, is taken from the genealogy he gives us of these kings. The whole frame of this history, as delivered by him, depends on the genealogy and names of these forty kings ; which, if they prove counterfeit and forged, the fabric built upon them must fall to the ground, since nothing ought to be more certain than the persons themselves of whom the history treats. Now I conceive it may be evidently shown, that both the names of the most part of Boece's kings, and the descent or genealogy which he gives of them, in as far as it differs from the old genealogy contained in Fordun, are a modern invention about Boece's own time.

In order to put this matter in a full view, the reader will find here two tables ; the first divided into four columns, whereof the first three contain three different copies of the old genealogy of the predecessors of our kings, from Fergus, son of Ferchard, called Fergus I., to Fergus, son of Erch, or of Fergus II., according as they are set down in three different periods of time by writers of different ages.² All which, nevertheless,

¹ D. Abercromb. Hist. Scot. tom. ii.

² Vide the genealogical tables.

'atalogue of Boece's
ty Kings.

f' Ferchard
g' Ferchard
Fergus
of Main
f Main*
Dornadill
g' Reuther
Reuther*
.euther
isina
nan*
n of Durst
of Evenus*
her to Even. i.
o' Durst
of Ederus*
ens' nephew
ellan's nephew
heus' brother
red's nephew*
, al. Galgaucus, Cor-

Galdus' son*
ac's nephew*
ld's son
ld's nephew
's brother*
d.'s brother
o Ethod. i.
ii.'s son*
rper*
's son
irco's son
rper
loc's son
loc's nephew
inth's nephew*
linth's nephew
linth's nephew
omare's son
f Erth

is marked with an *
gs, either arraigned,
punished, or put to
ubjects, according to
ianan's Histories.

TABLE I

| List of the keys, or Signs, from Elmer Schenck's "Flora of Peru" | |
|--|---|
| to the original Scandinavian Version | to the original of the Truth and Trustfulness Version |
| 1. <i>Erythrina</i> , <i>of</i> <i>Precariat</i> | 1. <i>Erythrina</i> , <i>of</i> <i>Precariat</i> |
| 2. <i>Forrestia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>edges</i> . | 2. <i>Forrestia</i> . |
| 3. <i>Mareca</i> | 3. <i>Marin</i> |
| 4. <i>Archibell</i> | 4. <i>Diamond</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Diamond</i> |
| 5. <i>Kottern</i> | 5. <i>Kottern</i> |
| 6. <i>Kottern</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Kottern</i> | 6. <i>Kottern</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Rathut</i> |
| 7. <i>Trochis</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Thiot</i> | 7. <i>Trochis</i> |
| 8. <i>Loon</i> | 8. <i>Loon</i> . |
| 9. <i>Stern</i> | 9. <i>F</i> . |
| 10. <i>Dickobol</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Dickobol</i> | 10. <i>Dickobol</i> |
| 11. <i>Lat</i> | 11. <i>Lat</i> |
| 12. <i>Bella</i> | 12. <i>Bella</i> |
| 13. <i>Boghtan</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Wau</i> | 13. <i>Boghtan</i> |
| 14. <i>Flucksal</i> | 14. <i>Fluck skald</i> |
| 15. <i>Cormorant</i> | 15. <i>Cormorant</i> |
| 16. <i>Red-crested</i> | 16. <i>Red-crested</i> |
| 17. <i>Hoodedness</i> | 17. <i>Hoodiness</i> |
| 18. <i>Violentness</i> | 18. <i>Violence</i> |
| 19. <i>Lapwing</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Hilde</i> | 19. <i>Lapwing</i> |
| 20. <i>Mogulami</i> | 20. <i>Mogulami</i> |
| 21. <i>Astar</i> | 21. <i>Astar</i> |
| 22. <i>Tschudia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 22. <i>Tschudia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> |
| 23. <i>Brachionus</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Ustulata</i> | 23. <i>Brachionus</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Ustulata</i> |
| 24. <i>Eos</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Amelanchier</i> | 24. <i>Eos</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Amelanchier</i> |
| 25. <i>Akulow</i> | 25. <i>Akulow</i> , <i>or</i> <i>Amalow</i> |
| 26. <i>Tindie</i> | 26. <i>Tindie</i> |
| 27. <i>Crinobium</i> | 27. <i>Crinobium</i> |
| 28. <i>Seroticum</i> | 28. <i>Seroticum</i> |
| 29. <i>Frithian</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 29. <i>Frithian</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> |
| 30. <i>Anas</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 30. <i>Anas</i> |
| 31. <i>Fridholmia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 31. <i>Fridholmia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> |
| 32. <i>Amesia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 32. <i>Amesia</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> |
| 33. <i>Leptostomus</i> | 33. <i>Leptostomus</i> |
| 34. <i>h</i> , <i>or</i> <i>h</i> | 34. <i>h</i> |
| 35. <i>Exodus</i> | 35. <i>Exodus</i> |

T-11

| Table I | | Table II | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Spiral Galaxy Kinds | | Spiral Structure of the Kinds of Spiral Galaxies | |
| 1. Edge-on, E | 1. Edge-on, E | 1. Edge-on, E | 1. Edge-on, E |
| 2. Face-on, S | 2. Face-on, S | 2. Face-on, S | 2. Face-on, S |
| 3. Intermediate, SB | 3. Intermediate, SB | 3. Intermediate, SB | 3. Intermediate, SB |
| 4. Edge-on, R | 4. Edge-on, R | 4. Edge-on, R | 4. Edge-on, R |
| 5. Face-on, R | 5. Face-on, R | 5. Face-on, R | 5. Face-on, R |
| 6. Intermediate, R | 6. Intermediate, R | 6. Intermediate, R | 6. Intermediate, R |
| 7. Edge-on, Ir | 7. Edge-on, Ir | 7. Edge-on, Ir | 7. Edge-on, Ir |
| 8. Face-on, Ir | 8. Face-on, Ir | 8. Face-on, Ir | 8. Face-on, Ir |
| 9. Intermediate, Ir | 9. Intermediate, Ir | 9. Intermediate, Ir | 9. Intermediate, Ir |
| 10. Edge-on, Bar | 10. Edge-on, Bar | 10. Edge-on, Bar | 10. Edge-on, Bar |
| 11. Face-on, Bar | 11. Face-on, Bar | 11. Face-on, Bar | 11. Face-on, Bar |
| 12. Intermediate, Bar | 12. Intermediate, Bar | 12. Intermediate, Bar | 12. Intermediate, Bar |
| 13. Edge-on, B | 13. Edge-on, B | 13. Edge-on, B | 13. Edge-on, B |
| 14. Face-on, B | 14. Face-on, B | 14. Face-on, B | 14. Face-on, B |
| 15. Intermediate, B | 15. Intermediate, B | 15. Intermediate, B | 15. Intermediate, B |
| 16. Edge-on, R | 16. Edge-on, R | 16. Edge-on, R | 16. Edge-on, R |
| 17. Face-on, R | 17. Face-on, R | 17. Face-on, R | 17. Face-on, R |
| 18. Intermediate, R | 18. Intermediate, R | 18. Intermediate, R | 18. Intermediate, R |
| 19. Edge-on, Bar | 19. Edge-on, Bar | 19. Edge-on, Bar | 19. Edge-on, Bar |
| 20. Face-on, Bar | 20. Face-on, Bar | 20. Face-on, Bar | 20. Face-on, Bar |
| 21. Intermediate, Bar | 21. Intermediate, Bar | 21. Intermediate, Bar | 21. Intermediate, Bar |
| 22. Edge-on, R | 22. Edge-on, R | 22. Edge-on, R | 22. Edge-on, R |
| 23. Face-on, R | 23. Face-on, R | 23. Face-on, R | 23. Face-on, R |
| 24. Intermediate, R | 24. Intermediate, R | 24. Intermediate, R | 24. Intermediate, R |
| 25. Edge-on, Bar | 25. Edge-on, Bar | 25. Edge-on, Bar | 25. Edge-on, Bar |
| 26. Face-on, Bar | 26. Face-on, Bar | 26. Face-on, Bar | 26. Face-on, Bar |
| 27. Intermediate, Bar | 27. Intermediate, Bar | 27. Intermediate, Bar | 27. Intermediate, Bar |
| 28. Edge-on, R | 28. Edge-on, R | 28. Edge-on, R | 28. Edge-on, R |
| 29. Face-on, R | 29. Face-on, R | 29. Face-on, R | 29. Face-on, R |
| 30. Intermediate, R | 30. Intermediate, R | 30. Intermediate, R | 30. Intermediate, R |
| 31. Edge-on, Bar | 31. Edge-on, Bar | 31. Edge-on, Bar | 31. Edge-on, Bar |
| 32. Face-on, Bar | 32. Face-on, Bar | 32. Face-on, Bar | 32. Face-on, Bar |
| 33. Intermediate, Bar | 33. Intermediate, Bar | 33. Intermediate, Bar | 33. Intermediate, Bar |
| 34. Edge-on, R | 34. Edge-on, R | 34. Edge-on, R | 34. Edge-on, R |
| 35. Face-on, R | 35. Face-on, R | 35. Face-on, R | 35. Face-on, R |
| 36. Intermediate, R | 36. Intermediate, R | 36. Intermediate, R | 36. Intermediate, R |
| 37. Edge-on, Bar | 37. Edge-on, Bar | 37. Edge-on, Bar | 37. Edge-on, Bar |
| 38. Face-on, Bar | 38. Face-on, Bar | 38. Face-on, Bar | 38. Face-on, Bar |
| 39. Intermediate, Bar | 39. Intermediate, Bar | 39. Intermediate, Bar | 39. Intermediate, Bar |
| 40. Edge-on, R | 40. Edge-on, R | 40. Edge-on, R | 40. Edge-on, R |
| 41. Face-on, R | 41. Face-on, R | 41. Face-on, R | 41. Face-on, R |
| 42. Intermediate, R | 42. Intermediate, R | 42. Intermediate, R | 42. Intermediate, R |
| 43. Edge-on, Bar | 43. Edge-on, Bar | 43. Edge-on, Bar | 43. Edge-on, Bar |
| 44. Face-on, Bar | 44. Face-on, Bar | 44. Face-on, Bar | 44. Face-on, Bar |
| 45. Intermediate, Bar | 45. Intermediate, Bar | 45. Intermediate, Bar | 45. Intermediate, Bar |

making a due allowance for the mistakes of transcribers, are everywhere the same ; and as they all agree in the main, so they all entirely differ from the new genealogy given by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers. Of these four columns in the first table, the first contains the names of the old genealogy, as they are written in the original Gaelic or old Scottish ; the second contains the same names, according to the more ancient and more correct copies done by Lowlanders, from the twelfth till the fourteenth or fifteenth age. The third column contains the same names, such as they are found in the latest and most incorrect copies of the fifteenth and sixteenth ages. In fine, in the fourth column are set down the names of those of Boece's forty kings that are taken from the old genealogy, and formed upon the most incorrect, and by consequence the latest, copies of it contained in the third column.

The second table is divided into two columns ; in the first is set down the series or catalogue of Boece's first forty kings, with the new parentage he has assigned to them. The second column contains the scheme of the new genealogy framed by Boece or his vouchers for his forty kings, from Fergus I. till Fergus II.

The reader, having the tables in his view, will be more able to judge of the reflections I am to make upon them.

The first thing to be observed concerning these genealogies is, that the old genealogy, such as it is contained in the three first columns of the first table, and given by Fordun¹ in two different places of his chronicle, was the only known genealogy of the Scotish kings till the year 1526, that Boece's history, with a new genealogy, never heard of before, was published ; and this genealogy given by Fordun is attested by the authority of the writers of all ages and countries who set down that of the kings of Scots.

In the twelfth age, the author of the genealogy in the ms. entitled, *Chronica Regum Scotorum*, set down in the Appendix, n. 4, who was a Scotish writer, and Radulfus de Diceto, dean of London, an English writer, relate both of them this genealogy just as it is set down by Fordun ; and that they both wrote in the twelfth age appears by their carrying up the genealogy from our King William, as being the king then reigning ; and those are the oldest copies to be now met with of the genealogy of the Scotish kings, excepting the accounts we have of it from the Irish writers, who pretend to have it of a much higher antiquity ; and their accounts of that genealogy are the same in the main as Fordun's, and differ only in four or five names.

In the thirteenth age, the *Highland Scanachy* or *Antiquary*,

¹ Fordun, edit. Hearn. lib. 5, c. 50, pp. 487, 759.

mentioned by all Fordun's continuators, and by Major, pronounced this genealogy in the same series of names, from Fergus, son of Erch, to Fergus, son of Ferchar, and upwards, at the coronation of King Alexander III., A.D. 1249; and this being on so solemn an occasion, in presence of the three estates of the kingdom assembled for the coronation, carries with it the sense of the whole kingdom, especially that of all the *Highland Seanachies*, so well versed in, and so tenacious of, the ancient genealogies; and this whilst our ancient records or histories were as yet entire, and before they were destroyed by King Edward I.

In the fourteenth age, Walter Wardlaw, one of the most eminent persons for learning in his time, having been bred in the University of Paris, of which he was rector A.D. 1345, and afterwards Doctor in Divinity; and on his return home, chosen Bishop of Glasgo, and at last created Cardinal by Pope Clement VII., under whose obedience Scotland was,—this great man, whom Fordun consulted,¹ gave him the same genealogy in the same terms; and Fordun himself, after all his travels and searches, inserts this in his chronicle, as being the authentic genealogy of our kings, and conformable to what he had met with everywhere else.

In the fifteenth age, all the writers of the Scotish history, abbots, churchmen, and religious men of the chief churches and monasteries, continuators of Fordun, give us the same genealogy after him. In the very beginning of that age, Winton, canon regular and prior of Lochlevin, gives us the same genealogy in his chronicle, in verse, which he must have had from the records of St. Andrews or other chronicles, for it is evident he never saw Fordun. In the same age also, A.D. 1460, William Fratours,² canon of Aberdeen and prebendary of Philorth, gives us exactly the same genealogy, which he took, as he affirms, from several chronicles.

In fine, in the beginning of the sixteenth age, A.D. 1521, four years before Boece made his new discoveries of Veremund, &c., John Major published his history, and gave us from the Highland gentleman just the same genealogy as the rest, excepting the faults of transcribers or printing, which are without number in that short history, being printed at Paris whilst the author was absent in Scotland.

Thus we see, besides the English account of that genealogy, the same as ours, and the Irish, which differs only in four or five names, the Scotish writers in all ages, in all parts of the kingdom, south, north, and Highlands, the writers of the clergy and those of monasteries, all agree without exception, allowing for the faults of transcribers, on the same names and series of the

¹ Fordun, lib. 5, c. 50.

² Bibliot. Cotton.

genealogy, from Fergus, the son of Ferchar, called Fergus I., down to Fergus II., son of Erch. Nor will it be found upon inquiry that the genealogy given of our kings by Boece from Veremund, etc., or indeed any other than what I have set down from Fordun in the first table, was ever mentioned or heard of before the publishing Boece's history, A.D. 1526.

This might suffice to show that the genealogy published by Boece, and by consequence all that is built upon it, is nothing but an invention of his own time. But to bring that up to a full conviction, we are to consider, further, the differences there are betwixt the genealogy given by Boece and the only known genealogy to his time. These differences consist chiefly in two things,—1st, The abridging the number of the descent or degrees; and, 2d, what is a necessary consequence of that, the difference of the order or series of the descents or parentage, by placing some, that according to the ancient genealogy descended in the direct line, into the collateral line, that they might not be quite lost, as will appear by inspection of the three first columns of the first table containing the old genealogy, as it is found in different ages, compared with the genealogy given by Boece in the second table, col. 2.

It is to be observed that the alterations made by Boece or his vouchers were not the effect of their being ignorant of the old genealogy, for it was all the bottom they had to go upon; and we are, besides, well assured that Boece himself had that genealogy twice repeated in the ms. of Fordun already mentioned, which belonged to Boece, and was given by him to the library of the College of Aberdeen. But it appears that they designedly altered the genealogy for reasons of their own, whereof one seems to have been to render, as they imagined, their history of the forty kings more plausible. The ancient genealogy makes thirty-three generations from Fergus, son of Ferchar, till Fergus, son of Erch. Boece or his vouchers have reduced them to twenty-one or twenty-two. The design and intention of this abridging the genealogy seems to have been that they wisely considered that from Fergus I. till Fergus II. there were, according to Fordun's account, thirty-three generations during the space only of about 730 years, to wit, from the year 330 before the incarnation, till A.D. 403 after it; and that in much about the same number of years from Fergus II., beginning A.D. 403, till King David I.'s reign, A.D. 1124, there were only about twenty-one generations, and therefore they thought it much more plausible to reduce the number of the generations of the first race to that of twenty or twenty-one generations, as in the second, it not being very likely that in the same number of years there should be ten generations more in the first race,

when men were supposed rather to live longer, than in the second.

Fordun and these other writers that followed him did not make all these reflections, but set down with simplicity what they had received by tradition or found in writing : that Fergus I., son of Ferchard, came to Britain 330 years before the incarnation, and was the first king of the Scots ; that from this Fergus there was a succession of kings down till Fergus II., son of Erch, but no account of their lives and reigns, nor even of their names ; but finding the series of the genealogy and number of the generations betwixt these two Ferguses and that universally received, without examining whether there were not too many generations for that period of time, they honestly set them all down as they found them in former writers. Had Fordun placed the beginning of Fergus son of Erch's reign only in the year 503, instead of 403, all would have been right, and the number of generations of the first race would have agreed much better with that of posterior ages,—thirty-one generations from Fergus I. till Fergus II. in the space of 830, and thirty-one generations from the beginning of Fergus II., A.D. 503, till King Robert II., first of the name of Stuart, during about the same number of years. Had Fordun fixed upon that epoch of the reign of Fergus II., all had been right. But that is what Fordun did not reflect upon, and Boece or his vouchers, who saw there was some mistake in the number of generations, made things much worse by abridging the old and universally received genealogy, and forging partly out of it and partly out of their own imagination a new one never heard of before.

In consequence of Boece abridging the number of generations in the genealogy, many of the names must be different, and their relation one to another inverted. Many in the direct line, according to the old genealogy, being thrown into the collateral line in the new, the fathers and sons can be no more the same ; and so it is, for in the twenty-one generations to which Boece reduces the thirty-three of the old genealogy, only four or five are left as they were ; all the rest are changed, but nothing is lost, for the names cut off from the direct line serve to make up kings in the collateral ; some that were sons and fathers before are come to be brothers or cousins, but all of them kings, good or bad, and accordingly praised or punished as it was thought useful by those that created them, towards encouraging or curbing their successors in later times, and the compassing the other ends that the first inventors of these new discoveries proposed to themselves.

Thus only the three first names of the old genealogy—Fergus, Maine, and Aryndill, changed to Dornadilla—are preserved by

Boece, and all made kings. But Rouein, grandson to Aryndill, is left out, and Bede's Reuda or Reutha (whom Fordun had made the same with Rether) is substituted for Rouein, and made the seventh king by Boece, and made brother to Rether. Rosin, altered to Josina, grandchild to Rether, is made his son, and hath Ther or Thereus for his brother, who was his father, and both are made kings. Sin, changed to Fin or Finnan, is Boece's tenth king, and, instead of Dethach, Durstus is assigned to be his son. The rest of the new genealogy is so entirely different from the old, that, of Boece's twenty-eight kings following, there are scarce four to whom there is not given a new parentage, and they are made either brothers or cousins to those that were their fathers, according to the old genealogy; and many of them are entirely of new creation, or transplanted from other countries, and grafted in this new genealogy, as may be seen by comparing the old and new genealogy together.¹

For as the names contained in the old genealogy, being only thirty-two betwixt the two Ferguses, could not suffice to form Boece's thirty-eight kings (besides that there are four or five of the names left out, apparently on purpose to make room for others), there are added ten or twelve new names of kings, and all grafted in the new genealogy. Such are Feritharis, Metellanus, the three Donalds, Nothatus, Durstus, Gillus, Evenus III., Natholocus, Romachus, Caractacus, Galdus, besides Carausius, miscalled Carantius, and the famous Voadicia. And there seems a visible design in the choice of them all, suitable to the general scope which Boece, or the authors of his memoirs, seem to have levelled at in that history; each of them being appointed to act the personages either (1) of eminent models of virtuous princes to be imitated,—such are the characters attributed to Feritharis, Metellanus, and Donald, the first Christian king, never heard of before Boece; or (2) to act the personages of vicious and tyrannical kings, and accordingly punished by their subjects, to keep their posterity in awe. Such are Nothatus, Durstus, Gillus, Evenus III., Natholocus, Donaldus III., Romachus, etc. The third kind of new kings or princes grafted on the genealogy are the chief famous British warriors against the Romans, designed to set out the honour of the kingdom, and render the history more taking and agreeable to the natives. Such are Caractacus, king of the Silures; Galgacus, the famous Caledonian general, called by Boece Galdus, or Corbredus Galdus. And the warlike Carausius, miscalled Carantius, is also grafted on the new genealogy, as are likewise Voada and Voadicia.

¹ *Vide* the tables of genealogy.

SEC. 5.—*A third Proof against Boece's History is the Forty Kings' Names forged upon corrupted Names of the Old Genealogy, in or near Boece's own time.*

A third proof is drawn from the difference or variety that appears betwixt these names as they are set down in the most ancient and correct copies of the old genealogy, and the same names as they are deformed and corrupted in Boece's history. And here we have a new and evident proof, not only of the forgery of this new genealogy, and so of all the history built upon it, but these varieties point out to us the time in which these vouchers of Boece were coined—to wit, in the end of the fifteenth or beginning of the sixteenth age.

To set this in a clear light, let it be observed that the old names contained in our kings' genealogy are originally Gaelic or Irish, that being the ancient language of the Scots. By consequence, these names would be better preserved when transcribed by those that understood that language than by Lowlanders, who, being wholly ignorant of it, would more readily mistake and corrupt these names in transcribing them; and most of the copies we have of that genealogy being written by Lowlanders, the later the copies are the more incorrect they must be in course, each new transcriber adding his own mistakes to the faults of his copy. So, generally speaking, the more incorrect we find any of these copies of the genealogy, the more we are assured they were transcribed in later times. So, if these names be nowhere more corrupted and incorrect than in the copies on which Boece's kings and new genealogy have been framed, it will be a plain proof that the memoirs or vouchers he followed were of a very late date.

But to come more close to the precise date of the vouchers of Boece's history, there needs only for that but to compare the MSS. copies of the royal genealogy, written in the latter end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth age, with the true Gaelic or Irish names, and with the most ancient and best copies done in former ages, and both these copies with the names that Boece makes use of in his history, as taken from his Veremund, Campbell, and his other new annals of Scotland; and it will visibly appear that the compilers of those pretended annals lived not in the eleventh age, where Veremund is placed, nor in the twelfth or thirteenth, supposed to be the age of John Campbell, and that they were not Highlanders, as is pretended that the same Campbell and Cornelius Hybernicus were, but that they were the contrivance or workmanship of some Lowlander, and done upon copies of the genealogy written only

in the fifteenth or sixteenth age, such as they were a little before Boece's own time.

An evident proof of this is, that there hath been in the copies of the genealogy, on which Boece or his vouchers have composed their catalogue of kings, the very same corruptions¹ and false readings which we find in the copies of the fifteenth and sixteenth ages, and which are not commonly in the copies of the genealogy written in former ages, whereof the most ancient are generally the more correct and conformable to the genius of the Highland tongue. For example, in all the ancient copies of that genealogy preceding the fifteenth age, we read—Arindyll, Sin, Rosin, Echach or Ecchad, Achircir, Cruichlinch, Sencormac, Erch; whereas, in the corrupted copies of the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth age, and in these only, instead of Arindyll, we find Dearndill, upon which was forged Boece's fourth king, Dornadilla; instead of Sin, we read Fin, whence Boece's tenth king, Finanus; instead of Rosin, we find Josin, whence Boece's ninth king, Josina; in place of Echac, we find Ethod or Ethad, whence Boece's twenty-fifth and twenty-eighth kings, Ethodius I. and II. And a general mark that the transcribers of these genealogies lived in the fifteenth or sixteenth age is, that they for the most part read *th* for *ch*, as Athircir for Achirchir, whence Boece's twenty-ninth king, Athirco; and instead of Cruichlinch, they read Cruithlinth, whence Boece's thirty-fourth king, Crathlinthus; Fencormac, instead of Sencormac, whence Boece's thirty-fifth king; Fincormacus; instead of Erch, they read Erth, whence Boece's Erthus, father to Fergus II. To all these false readings of the latest transcribers of these genealogies, Boece or his helpers have added new ones of their own, which are not to be met with in any former copy of the genealogy, new or old, that I have seen, but may have been in the latest and most corrupted copies. Thus, instead of Fiachrach, they have probably read Siathrael, the *F* being changed into *S*, the *ch* into *th* in the middle of the word, and into *el* in the end of it—all which were ordinary mistakes in the fifteenth age, and only in it. And from this corruption of the name Fiachrach, become Siathrael, came Boece's twenty-sixth king, Sathrael. By all which it seems evident that the memoirs furnished to Boece, whatever name they bore, were late pieces forged upon corrupted copies of the old genealogy, not long before Boece's own time; and after they had been hidden some years, have been found out in Boece's time, and sent to him as copies of ancient histories of Scotland, probably betwixt the years 1522 and 1525; for in the²

¹ See column the third of the first table.

² Boeth. Vit. Episcop. Aberdon. fol. 30, 31.

year 1522, as I have already observed, Boece seems to have known nothing of the annals or other MSS. of Ycolmkill, but in the year 1525 he tells us he had his Veremundus, J. Campbell, etc., sent him from thence.

SEC. VI.—*Fourth Proof: Boece's History stuffed with Fables.*

A fourth proof of the forgery of Veremund, and of Boece's other vouchers, may be taken from the facts that he relates on the credit of his new vouchers, especially when these details which he gives are compared with the lame accounts we have of what passed in the northern parts of Britain, from the earliest and best historians, during those ages in which the forty kings are placed.

1st. Not to insist here upon the difficulties of the early settlement of the Scots in Britain (of which afterwards), the account that Boece gives of the extent of their dominions in their beginning is plainly contrary to the certain accounts that we have of the extent of the Pictish dominions in the sixth age of Christianity from Adamnanus, an eye-witness; for it is evident that the Picts, in the sixth age, possessed as yet, as they had done from the beginning, all the most northern parts of Scotland, which Boece makes his Fergus I. bestow liberally on the Scots, his followers, 800 years before.

2d. Boece's visible contradictions to the Roman writers in what passed in their own time, such as his accounts of Camelodunum, the Silures, the Brigantes, Caractacus, Voada, Carausius, etc., the Roman wars or treaties with the Scots in the times of his Kings Ederus, Metellanus, Mogaldus, Ethodius I., Donald I., etc.,—all which wars of the Scots with the Romans Buchanan found so visibly fictitious, that he either contradicted them or passed them over in silence, though Boece quotes his Veremund, or other vouchers, for them all.

3d. The fabulous stories in his history, copied from the Roman or other histories, such as the Scotish women married to the Picts interceding between their husbands and parents, like the Sabine in Titus Livius; King Mainus, like Numa, establishing the sacred rites; the tables of the laws made by Fergus I., Dornadilla, and others. And all politic deliberations and fine harangues he puts in his Scotish grandees' mouths, from the same Titus Livius and others. Besides these, his fables of new invention, as the message of Ptolemy, transformed from a geographer into a king of Egypt; that of the two philosophers from Spain with the knowledge of the true God many years before the incarnation; his making the Cambrians a distinct nation from the Britains; the story of Fergus II.'s expedi-

tion with Allarick to the destruction of Rome, and his bringing from thence a chest of books; and so many other such like stories, all built on the authority of his Veremund and other vouchers, but all rejected also, or passed over in silence, by Buchanan.

4th. In fine, the detail he gives of the lives, deaths, councils, wars, reigns, and all with their dates, of his forty kings, at as great length as if they had lived only a few ages before himself, and with as great assurance as if he had the authority of the best historians to go upon, is a new proof of a fertile invention. Besides that, even Veremundus' work, though it were extant, or could have been shown to be written in the eleventh age, could not be a sufficient authority to warrant a detail of transactions, many of which were past twelve or thirteen ages before.

SEC. VII.—*Fifth Proof: New Principles of Government.*

In fine, a fifth proof of the imposture of Veremund, and of the other pretended ancient writers, on whose authority Boece built all that he relates of the first forty kings, over and above what J. Fordun's chronicle contains, is the new maxims of state directly levelled against monarchical government, together with all the precedents and examples which he relates of the Scottish kings having been made accountable to their own subjects, and obnoxious to be punished by them for their mal-administration;—all which principles of government and precedents of popular power, prove not only the imposture of Boece's vouchers, but do also make it manifest that, far from being the writings of authors of the eleventh or twelfth ages, where his Veremund, Campbell, etc. are placed, they are late inventions, composed no sooner than the fifteenth age, after the death of King James III.,—that is, a little before Boece's own time.

To make this evident, it might suffice to show that there is not so much as one clear instance of any such power or right exercised or claimed by the Scots, whether nobility or people, assembled or separated, over their kings, to be met with in any ancient history or record, from the beginning of the monarchy till the reign of King James III. Rebels there had been in former ages among the Scots, as in other nations, and private traitors that have even attempted on the lives of their princes; but these, far from being countenanced by the subjects, had been, on the contrary, treated as they deserved by the far greatest part of the nation. There have also been factions and insurrections of discontented parties in Scotland, as in other

kingdoms; but these have generally been either quelled by the king's own prudence and authority, or suppressed by the concurrence of their loyal subjects; at least there never had been heard of among the Scots any such thing as an act of the states to justify rebellious proceedings against the sovereign, till the Act 'Of the Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Strive-ling,' made in the first Parliament of King James IV., A.D. 1488, composed chiefly of the actors of the tragedy.

That what I have here to say, in order to prove that the vouchers of Boece's history were posterior to the death of King James III., and to the Act, entitled 'Of the Debate of the Field of Strivelings,' made A.D. 1488, may not be misunderstood, I must here declare that in treating of this subject my intention is to keep exactly within the bounds of an historian or critic, and to examine a pure matter of fact necessary towards discovering the precise age or time of the contrivance of the writings under the titles of Veremundus, John Campbell, etc., made use of by Boece as vouchers of his history.

I have already shown in the preceding sections, by the errors of the copies of the old genealogy employed by the contrivers of these vouchers of Boece, that they could be no older than the fifteenth age. And here I intend to add a new proof of their being of that date, taken from the new maxims of government advanced by Boece on the credit of these writings, and particularly from the power attributed by them in ancient times to the nobles and people of Scotland to set up a tribunal for their kings, to call them to account for their administration, and to punish them for mal-administration with imprisonment, deposition, and even with death; and not content barely to advance these maxims as being principles or rules of the Scottish government, they have set down examples of their having been effectually put in practice against no less than about a third part of their forty kings, and upon several others of their successors.

So all that I intend here is to set down summarily on this head what is necessary to lay open the foundation on which Boece's history of the first forty kings seems to be built, and what appears to have been the occasion of its writing; and in order to that, to show in the first place that all that Boece's vouchers delivered of our kings being accountable to any under God for their administration, is contrary to the ancient laws, history, and custom of Scotland before the fifteenth age, and by consequence grounded only upon inventions in or about that time. 2d. To trace out the different steps and occasions by which the ancient notion of the right of the sovereignty of our kings came to be first obscured and diminished, and then the

right itself directly invaded by a faction of the nobility in the fifteenth age, whence followed by degrees new maxims concerning the power of the nobility or people over their kings in cases of pretended mal-administration, and a new scheme of our ancient history adapted to justify and impose those new maxims on posterity.

SEC. VIII.—*Principles of Scottish Government according to the Old Laws of Scotland.*

And first, as to our ancient laws. By all of them preceding the fifteenth age, our kings held their crown only and immediately of God, and were accountable to Him alone for their administration. None can be judged, or called to account, but by their superiors or peers. Our kings, by our ancient laws, had neither superiors nor equals on earth: '[Rex Scotiae]¹ nullum habet superiorem nisi ipsum Creatorem cœli & terræ, qui cuncta gubernat.' And again: 'Dominus rex² [Scotia] nullum potest habere parem, multo minus superiorem.' In all public acts, ancient and modern, our king is styled thus: 'Our Sovereign Lord the King.'³

The ancient kings of Scotland were by law and custom originally the sole fountain of all property, honours, or dignities, and of all temporal jurisdiction. As to property, our kings, till Malcolm II., were sole proprietors of all the lands of Scotland. Malcolm was the first that was pleased to give them out and divide them among his subjects. It is by this acknowledgment that our most ancient laws begin: 'Dominus rex Malcolmus⁴ dedit & distribuit totam terram Scotiae hominibus suis.' And all the lands of Scotland are to this day holden mediately or immediately of the king;⁵ and though they are become many ages ago hereditary by the king's gift, no heir can enter but by the king's authority and writ, and on condition to hold them of him, and to be faithful to him as sovereign.

The king is also the sole fountain of all titles of honour. It was his will and free choice that originally made a distinction between a nobleman and a commoner; and all noblemen of whatsoever degree are, as to their titles, honours, and privileges, the king's creatures, as the tenor of all their patents bears ('Creamus,' etc.); and even in the vulgar language their accession to their title, honour, or dignity is expressed by their being created lord, earl, duke, etc., by such or such of

¹ Regiam majestat. pref. n. 3.

² Ibid. lib. 2, c. 44, n. 3.

³ Supremus Dominus noster Rex.

⁴ Leges Malcolmi Mackeneth, c. 1, n. 1.

⁵ Fordun, lib. 4, c. 43.

our kings. Accordingly, our first earls are thought to be of Malcolm III.'s creation; our first dukes are of that of Robert III.; our first marquises and viscounts, of the creation of James VI.

The king is the sole fountain of all temporal jurisdiction and legislative power; all laws are both enacted and executed in his name and by his authority. Till the fifteenth age, our ancient laws ran in this style: 'Rex statuit,' or 'rex statuit cum consilio, aut deliberatione, & assensu prælatorum, comitum,' etc. All tribunals, from the highest to the lowest, sit and act by his authority; all courts are fenced in his name. The highest tribunal, that of the three estates or Parliament, is the king's great council; the several members of it are originally the king's counsellors, not his assessors; they have place and vote by authority derived originally from him alone. The lords or barons, spiritual or temporal, by his creation; the commissioners of shires, by the lands that they hold of his gift, are eligible to represent the shires; the royal burghs are all of the king's erection, and from his authority they derive their privilege to have deputies in Parliament. He alone made at first the distinction betwixt the royal burgh and the village. He alone hath power of the sword immediately from God, as His minister; and therefore by our laws, all rising in arms, all convocation of the lieges, without the king's order and his authority, was treason. Thus far as to our laws.

SEC. IX.—*Right of the Scottish Monarchy according to Old Histories.*

As to our histories, the only general histories we have now extant before King James the Third's reign, are John Fordun's and Winton's chronicles, and the several writers of our monasteries, who for the most part barely copied John Fordun's chronicle, or commented on it as far as he went, and continued it, and are known by the name of the several *Scotichronicons*. As to the chronicle of Melross, though more ancient than any of these, it begins only where Bede left off, in the eighth age; and till Malcolm Keanmore, it contains little of the Scottish affairs.

Now, in the first place, none of all these historians (and they are the only ones the Scots have till after King James the Third's death) have so much as one of the many instances or examples, related by Boece from his vouchers, of the Scottish nobility calling their kings to account, or claiming any power to judge them, whether before or after the reign of Fergus II. As to the instances brought from Boece's history of the first

forty kings preceding Fergus II., what we have already said in this article, and have as yet to add of that performance of Boece, is, I hope, sufficient to prove that all the particulars that Boece relates of the lives and actions of these forty kings (over and above what is contained in Fordun), and by consequence all the instances of the subjects exercising a power over their kings, are a plain forgery; so there is need of no further answer.

And as to the instances Boece gives of this power being exercised over our kings by their subjects, in the persons of six or seven of them, posterior to the reign of King Fergus II.—to wit, Constantine I., Ferquard I. and II., Eugen. VIII., Donald Mac-Alpin V., Ethus, and Culen,—as to these, I say, Fordun, the only ancient Scotish historian who with his continuators contain any account of these kings' reigns, hath not one word either of their bad administration or of their subjects exercising any power over them, but, on the contrary, gives a quite different account of such of them of whom he had found any particulars recorded.

Thus as to Constantine I. Whereas Boece relates that he was killed by one of his nobles for his wickedness, Fordun,¹ on the contrary, says not a word of his being a wicked prince, but that he died a natural death, after a long sickness.

As to Donald V. or Donald MacAlpin, who, says Boece, was a cowardly, vicious prince, and therefore degraded by his nobles, and thrown into prison, where he laid hands on himself, Fordun,² on the contrary, says he was a brave soldier, a warlike and victorious king, and after a happy reign died a natural death; and the chronicle of Pasly³ and others add, that he was lamented by the Scots at his death no less than Keneth the Great, his brother, had been.

As to King Ethus, who, according to Boece, was degraded by his nobles, and died in prison, Fordun⁴ hath not a word of it, but says that Ethus was killed in battle by his competitor King Gregory; and long before Fordun, the same account is given of King Ethus' death by other writers.

As to the Kings Ferquard I. and II., and Eugen. VIII., who, according to Boece's vouchers, were punished by their nobles for their bad administration, Fordun hath not one word of

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, cc. 17, 18.

² 'Erat enim [Donaldus] miles inclitus & ad omnes actus bellicos fortis & pronus.'—*Fordun*, lib. 4, c. 15.

³ 'Apud Sconam rex Donaldus universæ carnis viam ingressus in Iona sepultus est insula pro quo tanquam pro rege Kenedo a Scotis planctus extitit.'—*Scotichron. Paslat. ms. in bibl. regia Londin.* lib. 4, c. 15. — Idem in *Scotichron. Colleg. Edinb.*, in *Scotichron. de Panmure*, etc.

⁴ Fordun, lib. 4, c. 16.

that; nor was anything ever heard of it till, after King James III., it was first mentioned by Boece.

As to King Culen, Fordun¹ and other ancient writers own, indeed, he was a debauched prince; but none of them, before Boece, speaks of any combination of the nobles against him, but that he was killed by a private nobleman in revenge for having ravished his daughter. And even Buchanan² owns that the nobles and other subjects took highly ill that attempt on his person, though they hated his vices.

And these are all the examples or instances of our kings, since Fergus II., pretended, on Boece's sole authority or that of his vouchers, to have been called to account or punished by their nobles; of all which there is not the least mention made by any historian that wrote before the rebellion against King James III., and the Act made, A.D. 1488, to justify this rebellion. The first account we have of any of those tragedies is from Boece, after that king's death, and the passing that Act.

In the second place, not only there is no word in our ancient historians of the Scots claiming any power over their kings, but on the contrary these historians formally attest the king's sovereignty as the foundation of the monarchy, and indeed of all government among the Scots. Thus Fordun, when he relates the origin of government among the Scots,³ tells us that the Scots, at their first coming into Britain, were a rude, unpolished multitude, without any head or form of government, exposed to the oppression of the Picts; which Fergus, the son of Ferchar or Feradæc, a brave prince, of the royal descent of the Scots in Ireland, hearing of, and compassionating the condition of the Scots in Britain, came over to them with a great number of young men; and gathering together the Scots that had hitherto lived scattered among the Picts, and uniting them into one people with those he brought with him, he made himself the first king over them,⁴ and thus founded the Scots' monarchy in Britain,⁵

¹ Fordun, lib. 4, c. 28.

² Buchan. in Culen, r. 79, fol. 55.

³ 'Præterea dum Picti Scotos advenas hujusmodi damnis affligerent & angustiis, nunciatum est clanculo gentis sua majoribus, quali quantaque per eos degabant ærumpna.—Hæc igitur ut audivit nobilis quidam & immodiæ probitatis juvenis Fergus filius Ferhad, sive Ferchard, ex antiquorum prosapia regum progenitus, quod scilicet Acephala gens sua nationis absque rectore per Albionis vastas vagando solitudines, a Pictis ejecta degebat, cordis ob iram candescere cœpit. His igitur exhortationibus & ambitione regnandi stimulatus magnam sibi juvenum copiam accumulans, ad Albionem continuo progressus est, ubi segregatos e medio Pictorum Scotos accolas, una cum his quos secum attulerat, in occidentalibus insulæ locando finibus, ibidem super eos regem primum se constituit.'—*Fordun*, edit. Hearne, lib. 1, c. 34, p. 57.

⁴ 'Super eos regem primum se constituit.'—*Fordun*, lib. 1, c. 34.

⁵ 'Ad hanc insulam Albionis memoratus adveniens Fergusius, Scotorum primus rex in ea creatus est quibus & ipse datis legibus & statutis, ab occidentalibus quidem oceano regnum, & ab insulis usque dorsum Albaniæ dilatans, limites

giving laws and making statutes for the government of his new kingdom.

And this, as we have already observed, is the most ancient account we have, from our oldest historian extant, of the original of the Scottish monarchy; and, indeed, if we trace back all other certain histories, sacred or profane, we shall find monarchy was the first government of the world, and the first kings the work of divine Providence, not of the people; the very distinction of nobles and commons was an effect of the wisdom of the prince, to assure and maintain the government and observation of the laws, by settling order and subordination among the subjects, and ranking them according to their merits and abilities. And this account that Fordun left of the origin of the Scotish monarchy was adopted and copied by all the authors of the several *Scotichronicons* in the fifteenth age, as being the only notion the Scots had of it till that time.

Winton, our second general historian, though he had never seen Fordun, and wrote in the end of Robert III., or during the captivity of King James I., in the beginning of the fifteenth age, gives us much the same account of the right of monarchy among the Scots as Fordun does, and delivers it as a firm conclusion that our kings are independent, and hold their crown and royal authority immediately of God, and are answerable to Him alone for their administration; when, after having related how King Kenneth MacAlpin came to the Pictish crown, by the overthrow of that ancient people, he goes on in these words:—

The Scottis foundit on yair richt¹
 Bot ony help of outward micht
 Yai recoverit Swa yair heretage
 Evir to lest² with yair Lynage:
 And our Kyng til hald his state
 Of God Himselv immediate:
 Swa for his Ward and his relief
 Crete he with God for his Cheys,³
 And nane uthir mannis persounie
 Hald this a firm conclusioun.⁴

This in modern English prose is as follows:—

‘The kings of Scotland claimed and entered into the possession of the Pictish crown under the right and by the title of the Piets, without the assistance of any foreign force. Thus

ibidem inter regna constituit: nam orientalis oceanii regnum Pieti coluerunt.’—*Fordun*, lib. 2, c. 11, p. 85.

¹ That of the Piets.

² ‘Leif,’ MS.

³ ‘For he is,’ al. MS.

⁴ Winton’s Chronicle, ms. biblioth. reg. Lond. f. 93, and bibl. jurid. Edinb. in the prologue of the sixth book.

they recovered their inheritance, to remain for ever with their race, and to be holden by them immediately, and only of God Himself: so that our king, for his holding and dependence, hath none to treat with but God as his only superior, and with no other person whatsoever. Hold this as a firm conclusion.'

Thus Winton : and by these two writers, Fordun and Winton, the most ancient, and, indeed, the only general historians the Scots have extant before the tragedy of King James III., and who wrote independently one of another, as is plain by their works, as well as by all our ancient laws above mentioned, we see what notion the Scots had of the right of monarchy, and on what footing it was among them in the beginning of the fifteenth age.

Until that time the peace and tranquillity of the kingdom, the rights of our kings, and of the subjects, were maintained and preserved on the part of the subjects by the singular respect and attachment that the Scots had for the ancient royal line of their kings, by their just administration, and by the grateful memory of so many of their royal predecessors that had sacrificed themselves for preserving or recovering their liberty and independency ; and on the king's part by a tender regard that our ancient kings had for their subjects, which was chiefly grounded upon their uniform and hearty concurrence to support the crown, and their readiness to march whenever called upon—and that on their own expenses—under the royal banner, either to suppress all intestine commotions or repulse all foreign invasions: of all which our true histories furnish abundance of examples in every age. So the bond or knot that united our ancient kings and people, till the long minorities that chiefly gave rise to the factions of the fifteenth age, was no other than a mutual confidence which they had one in another, they both being equally persuaded that the interests of each were dear to the other ; and this confidence made their happiness and mutual security, without any further ties than the usual oath of allegiance that the subjects took to their kings, and that of our ancient kings at their coronation, which in those times was very simple, but in its august simplicity included all that was necessary for the subjects' security and happiness.

This is the account that our ancient historians give of it. At the coronation of each king, before he is blessed or anointed, he takes an oath, containing three promises, in this form :—

‘ In the name of Christ,’ I promise these three things to

¹ ‘ In Christi nomine promitto hac tria populo Christiano mihi subdito. Imprimitur, Me præcepturum & opere pro viribus impensurum ut ecclesia Dei & populus Christianus veram pacem in nostro arbitrio, nostro tempore servet. 2d. Ut

the Christian people my subjects :— 1st. That I shall give order, and employ my force and assistance, that the church of God and the Christian people may enjoy true peace during our time, under our government. 2d. I shall prohibit and hinder all persons, of whatever degree, from violence and injustice. 3d. In all judgments I shall follow the prescriptions of justice and mercy, to the end that our clement and merciful God may show mercy to me and to you.'

And this is all the account we have of the engagements that our ancient kings made to their subjects; and the only guarantee or surety of the performance was the king's own conscience, and the hopes he had of the mercy of God. Thus our kings of the race of Malcolm Keanmore and St. Margaret lived with their people in the times we begin to have the surest and fullest accounts of our history ; and whilst in our neighbourhood the contentions betwixt the kings and subjects were often carried to the greatest extremities, and new securities exacted of their kings by the name of Magna Charta, whereas in Scotland, as we read of no complaints made by the body of the subjects in those ages against their kings for oppressing their just rights and liberties, so there was no occasion of seeking redress, and much less of exacting from our kings public charters to secure them ; accordingly, the name of Magna Charta was never heard of in Scotland, nor do we find in all our ancient records or history that anything like to it was ever exacted of any of our kings in ancient times. As to our kings taking the coronation oath before the ceremony of their unction, which some of the adversaries of the sovereignty of our ancient kings have made a handle of, those writers, it seems, did not know or reflect that the ceremony of unction of our kings was not in use in Scotland till the time of Robert I., who obtained an express Bull from Pope John XXII. for that end ; and accordingly his son, King David II., was anointed after the manner of other Christian kings, and the ceremony performed according to the rites of the Roman pontifical, which being adapted to the unction of kings of all kinds, as well elective as hereditary, it is no wonder that the coronation oath is placed in the order of the rite before the actual unction. But nothing can be alleged from that ceremony in favour of the notion of a mutual stipulation between our ancient kings and people, as if the failing on one side did free the other ; for what a famous writer (whose authority on this head is beyond all exception, and out of reach

rapacitates & omnes iniquitates omnibus gradibus interdicam. 3d. In omnibus judiciis æquitatem & misericordiam extollam ut mihi & vobis indulget misericordiam suam clemens & misericors Deus.'—*Scotichron. Paslat. in Bibl. reg. Lond., and Scotichron. de Panmure, lib. 4, c. 6.*

of suspicion) says of the kings of Scotland in his time, is at least no less certain in regard of all our ancient kings,¹ ‘that the king hath his authority how soon the breath of his father goes out, and acts with full regal power before he be crowned; so the coronation is only a solemn inauguration in that which is already his right.’ And in effect what this learned writer asserts in this place is conformable to the Scotish history and records, by which it appears that our kings (even after the introduction of the ceremony of the unction, made use of for the first time² at the coronation of King David II., A.D. 1329) in their charters and other public acts dated the years of their reign from the death of their immediate predecessor, without regard to the time of their own coronation. We have a famous example of this in the reign of King James I. of Scotland, who, though he had been taken at sea, and carried prisoner into England, being then a child of fourteen years of age, before the death of his father, King Robert III., A.D. 1406, and was detained there about eighteen years, till A.D. 1424, that he came home to Scotland and was crowned, yet in all his charters, as well as in his Parliaments, the years of his reign are dated from the death of the king his father, A.D. 1406.

And even as to the coronation oath, such as I have set it down from the continuators of Fordun in the fifteenth age, it may be doubted whether it was in use before the introduction of the ceremony of the anointing, performed according to the rites of the Roman pontifical, where this coronation oath makes a part of the ceremonial, and is set down in equivalent terms with that which I have inserted above; for I have hitherto met with no account of it in what I have seen of our histories and records before that time, though the ceremony of the coronation of our kings, particularly that of King Alexander III., is recorded at large, with many minute circumstances, in the continuation of Fordun.³ And as to the *Scotichronicon*’s inserting the form of the oath, which I have set down above, in his relation of the reign of the same King Alexander III., as the author treats there of the duties of kings in general only, what he says of the coronation oath may have relation only to the practice of his own time, in the fifteenth century, when he wrote; but I refer this point of criticism to the judgment of those who may have more

¹ *Vindication of the Authority of the Constitution, etc.*, by Gilbert Burnet, Professor of Theology in Glasgow, A.D. 1673, confer. I, p. 153.

² ‘Ante quem [Davidem R. II.] nullus regum Scotiæ legitur fuisse inunctum (sic) vel cum tali solemnitate coronatum (sic).’ — *Fordun*, edit. Hearne, p. 1018.

³ *Fordun*, edit. Hearne, pp. 757-760.

opportunity than I could have to peruse and examine the large continuators of Fordun and the records of Scotland. Meantime, whether our ancient kings before King David II. took or took not the fore-mentioned oath at their coronation, is a pure matter of fact or curiosity ; for besides that, their obligations to preserve all their subjects, of both the spiritual and temporal estates, in their just rights and privileges, were not the less binding before God, to whom alone they were answerable for their administration. The mutual confidence, as I have already observed, betwixt our ancient kings and their people, the paternal affection these kings had for them, and the interest they had to maintain peace and union in the kingdom for their own as well as for their subjects' security and happiness, were in those days no less powerful guarantees of our kings discharging the obligations and engagements annexed by Almighty God to their eminent station as His vicegerents, than all the ties, oaths, and acts that have been added in the latter ages, as any person that will examine the true history of Scotland may be easily convinced of.

I have insisted on this digression, without any other design than to vindicate our country in general, and in particular our ancient nobility, from the accusation of barbarity and want of due respect to their kings in ancient times, which our modern historians since the fifteenth century have, by their trusting to forged vouchers (to say nothing here of some of their principles and particular views), given strangers occasion to load them with ; whereas in reality it is quite reverse, and will appear so to all that will impartially examine the remains that we have of true history till the confusions of the kingdom, occasioned particularly by the many long minorities in that fifteenth age ; there being perhaps nowhere to be met with in any kingdom whatsoever a more entire union betwixt king and people, a more constant adhesion of subjects to the royal line, nor greater respect paid to the sovereign by all, and particularly by the nobility, than in Scotland in ancient times, as it will appear to any that will take information from our only remaining historians before the fifteenth age,— Fordun with his continuators, and Winton, and from our records.

By all this, as well as by what we have related of our ancient laws and histories till the beginning of the fifteenth age, it is manifest that all the principles, and, more yet, the exercise of the deposing power in regard of the ancient kings of Scotland, in a word, the whole frame of Boece's history, or rather of the vouchers that he copied after, is new, unprecedented in all former reigns before that of King James III., unknown to the Scots in preceding ages, and hatched on purpose to serve the

turn of the ringleaders of the rebellion against that prince, and to fortify the Act which they made to screen themselves from the punishment due by all our ancient laws to their crime.

We are now to inquire into the different steps by which the new notion of a power in the nobles or people, to limit or restrain that of the crown, was first introduced among the Scots in the fifteenth age, and which grew up by degrees afterwards to that height as to produce all those dreadful convulsions that our posterior histories relate.

The feeble reign of King Robert III., followed by the long captivity of King James I., gave the cause of great confusions in the kingdom. In these days, says a writer¹ of that time, there was no law observed in Scotland; the great and powerful oppressed the weak, crimes remained unpunished, and justice seemed to be banished out of the kingdom. In effect, it was chiefly then that some of the great men first began to act within their own lordships as if they had had an independent authority, and as little kings; their power and great attendance screening them from the pursuit of justice, they assembled men in arms, and made war one against another.

In this case King James I. found the kingdom at his return from England, A.D. 1424. And being a prince of resolution, and a severe justiciary, he endeavoured by all means to retrieve the rights of the crown, re-establish order and public safety by his good laws, and his steadiness and inexorable severity in the execution of them, and in punishing the transgressors, without respect of persons, of whatsoever quality; as we may see by his ordering, the very next year after his return home, Duke Murdoch, the late governor, to be arrested and imprisoned, with his sons, and the Earls of Lenox, March, Douglas, and Angus, and many others, all the most powerful men in the kingdom; and yet more in the execution of the same Duke Murdoch and his sons, of the Earl of Lenox, and of several others, and in the forfeiture of the most ancient and most powerful Earl of March. And nothing can more effectually show how deeply the respect for the royal authority was as yet rooted in the hearts of the Scots, than this daring step of a king who was newly returned from a captivity of eighteen years, and almost a stranger to his people, and who was lately entered upon the government.

These severe executions lay, indeed, very heavy on the minds of some of the great men accustomed to live, during some years,

¹ ‘A.D. 1402. In diebus illis non erat lex in Scotia: sed quilibet potentiorum juniores opprescit & totum regnum fuit unum Latrocinium: homicidia, depredaciones, incendia, & cætera maleficia remanserunt impunita, & justitia relegata extra regni terminos exulavit.’—*Chartular. vet. Moravien.* fol. 62.

independent, and gave them a jealousy of the regal power, whereof most of them, by the long disuse of it in the king's absence for so many years, had never as yet felt the weight nor known the extent of its authority. But the king having by these severities re-established the public tranquillity, and delivered his subjects from oppression, and all the executions being according to law, and upon a fair trial of their peers, he was applauded by the far greatest part of the nation, and gained so universally the hearts of his people, that the malcontents among the nobles were forced to stifle their resentments during the rest of the king's reign; but they broke out with greater violence during those of his son and grandson,—several other things happening during this reign which augmented still more their fears and jealousies of the royal authority, and some that contributed to their exerting their resentments.

Among others, the reassuming the crown - lands,¹ whereof many of the great men had got themselves possessed by the profuseness of the late governors, became a new occasion of discontent. The forfeiture of the Earl of March,² however well intended to remove so powerful a man from the neighbourhood of England, proved of bad consequence in the following reigns. The Earl of March was a rival to, and check upon, the Earl of Douglas; and this balance being taken off, the great power of the Earl of Douglas, and of his family and followers, proved an unsupportable burden to the crown, and encouraged them to endeavour what had never been attempted before, that is (according to the phrase of the times), to bell the cat, or to make head against the king, and defy the government; especially being sure, in case of the worst, of a safe refuge and support from England.

Another occasion of the growth of the power of the nobles, to balance that of the crown, was the combining of several gentlemen one with another in bonds of mutual defence, called bonds of Manred, against any that should attack them. We have a famous example of this, during the reign of King James II., in the bond or league of the Earls of Douglas and Crawford; and though this cost the first his life, and chiefly contributed to ruin that powerful family, and though it had been prohibited by severe Acts of Parliament³ in King James I.'s time, it continued in the following reigns, and became the source of the greatest convulsions of the kingdom.

But nothing contributed more to diminish the respect and awe of the majesty of our kings, and to enervate the regal authority, and so to lay the foundation of these convulsions of the government, than the long minorities, especially of the Kings James II.

¹ Jac. I. Parl. I. c. 9.

² Jac. I. Parl. XII. c. 135.

³ Parl. II. King James I. c. 30.

and III. During those intervals, though the laws were enacted and the royal authority exercised in the name of the king, yet the whole exercise of it was, by necessity, committed by the estates of the kingdom to some of the great men; who, often envying one another, to fortify each his party by the king's person, though a child, stole him, as it were by turns, one from another, which did not a little contribute to diminish the respect due to his person, which till then had always been esteemed by the Scots as sacred, of whatever age he was.

Besides that, the exercise of the regal authority being in these minorities but precarious, in whosesoever hands it was lodged, and their administration depending on the states and nobility, those that exercised it durst not oftentimes venture to exert it, for fear of disobliging or incurring the opposition of others able to dispossess them. Whence it happened that some of the more powerful among the nobility lived in a kind of independency of the government and laws, without yielding any obedience, or even paying any respect to them; and being accustomed to this licentious way of living during the minorities, endeavoured to keep themselves in possession of it by force, even when the king came at age.

Such, in particular, were the Earls of Douglas, who, being powerful by their own followers, and yet more by their combining with other great men, arrived at that height of presumption as to march with displayed banners at the head of a great army, composed of their rebellious adherents, against the king. In those turbulent times, the kings were often obliged to manage with great caution the rest of their nobility, to keep them firm in their duty; and for the same reason, to use condescensions to their Parliaments, and allow them a larger share in the administration than was usual in the reigns of their ancestors. Some new and unusual expressions, which we meet with in the style of some of the Parliaments of these times, have been abused by a late writer,¹ as if these expressions were to be looked upon as the standard of the Scotish constitution; not considering that, besides that most of these Acts were made during minorities, none of them but may be understood in a sense not derogatory to the right of monarchy, allowance being made to the circumstances of those times, and the divisions and tumultuous state of affairs occasioned by the fears and jealousies, industriously spread betwixt the kings and their subjects by seditious and designing men,—all which passages have been thoroughly discussed by the late learned historian Dr. Pat. Abercromby, whose history, I mean chiefly the second volume of it, being generally better supported than

¹ Historical Account of the Rights of Scots' Parliament, A.D. 1703.

any other by records and authentic documents, is the best written piece of our history that I know of.

It was chiefly under the reign of King James III. that all these different seeds of fears and jealousies betwixt that king and a discontented party of his nobles increased to the greatest height, and produced the most dismal effects, by the protection that England gave to the factious party, and by the divisions industriously sown by men of that party in the royal family; and by their infusing, first, into the Duke of Albany, the king's brother, the poison of their rebellion, and the base and ambitious design of usurping his brother's crown,¹ and holding it of the king of England; and afterwards, the same factious men seducing the king's own son, the prince, to head their party, they brought to the field an army composed of the accomplices of their rebellion, and of their followers, against their sovereign, who, attended only by a part of his army, having precipitated unwarily a battle, before the rest of his loyal subjects, who were on their march from the north to his aid, were arrived, was defeated by the rebels, and barbarously murdered in the pursuit.

After which that same factious party,² observing that their young king began to repent of the crime in which they had engaged him, and that for penance, and as a sign of his repentance, he wore an iron chain, and fearing his resentment, to secure their lives and fortunes from the punishment due by all the ancient laws of the land, they obliged that young inexperienced prince, who was still in their hands, to call an assembly in a parliamentary form; and there being a great majority (the loyal party, inferior in number, and seeing their prince, now their king, at the head of that assembly, not able, or not daring to oppose), made that unprecedented Act, A.D. 1488, entitled, 'The Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Striveling,' to acquit themselves and justify their rebellion. And as they knew how odious their crime was to all, both without and within the kingdom,—without it, to all princes and states in amity with Scotland, such as the pope, who had excommunicated all that had a hand in it, to France, Spain, Denmark, and other realms,—they therefore enacted that the king's seal and those of the three estates should be appended to this Act, in order to be shown, as should seem expedient for the time, to all these different princes. So the Act bears, and is set down by Dr. Abercromby,³ from the black Acts in the life of King James III., to whom I shall refer my reader for all that concerns this tragedy, and shall only take notice that this Act, far from justifying the

¹ Abercromby's Life of King James II. pp. 443, 444, etc.

² Pitscotty History, p. 96.

³ Abercromb. tom. ii. pp. 476, 477, etc.

party with the rest of the world, abroad or at home, it did not so much as justify them in their own consciences ; and far from thinking themselves innocent, free, and quit of the slaughter of King James III., etc., as they pretended in this Act, they were so conscious to themselves of their guilt, that they had recourse to Pope Innocent VIII. to obtain absolution of their crime, and from the censures of the church, which they had incurred by their rebellion ; protesting ‘that they were sorry from the bottom of their hearts for their rebellion, and desirous to do penance for it.’ Upon which the pope empowered the abbots of Paisly and Jedward, and the Chancellor of Glasgo, to give them absolution, as is more at length contained in the original Bull in the Advocates’ Library at Edinburgh, dated 27th January 1491. Within the kingdom the horror of that crime was yet greater, and more universal and lasting ; for notwithstanding the aforesaid Act made to palliate it, the heavy murmurs and complaints of the people continued above three years afterwards, especially upon account that no inquiry had been made after the authors of the slaughter of the king. For this reason the third Parliament of King James IV., assembled at Edinburgh the 20th of February 1491–92, made at last an Act, which begins thus : ‘ Alswa, be the command and advertisement of our sovereign lord the king,¹ it is avisit and ordainit be the lordis of the articlis (these are the proper words of the Act) for the eschewing and cessing of the hevy murmur and voice of the people of the dede² and slaughter of umquhile,³ our sovereign Lordis father and progenitor, quhom God assolzie,⁴ King James III. That the persone or personis that put violent handis in his person and slew him, are nocth punisht ; the quhilk personis to be knawin and punisht after their demerits, our sovereign Lord is maist desirous ; and for the knowledge thairof, quhat persone or personis were committaris of the said odious and cruel deid with their hands ; it is now statute and ordainit in this present Parliament, that,’ etc. The Act goes on and promises a reward to those that shall make known those that were the murderers of the late king with their hands ; which affected expression is repeated no less than five different times in this Act, whereas the ordinary tenor of such Acts uses to include all that were airt and pairt, that is, aiders and abettors of any murder, or (as it is expressed in Queen Mary’s proclamation, 12th February 1567, for the discovery of the murderers of King Henry, her husband) the ‘ personis, devisoris, counsalors, or actual committars of the said mischievous and treasonable murder.’ But there being among those that sat in this Parlia-

¹ Records of the Parliament of King James IV., fol. 155.
² The late.

³ Death.
⁴ Absolve.

ment, A.D. 1492, and that devised this Act, many of those that had been actually in arms in pursuit of their sovereign king, James III., when he was killed, they were careful in wording of it, so as that it might not reach themselves, and therefore took care it should be expressed in this unusual tenor, and comprehend only those that had put violent hands on the king's person, or murdered him with their own hands.

But such an unnatural rebellion against one of the best¹ princes of his time needed more than Acts made by the authors of the wickedness, met together in a packed assembly in the form of a Parliament, under a young prince whom they had made, in as much as in them lay, a parricide, and who was still detained in the hands of those that had murdered his father,—there needed more, I say, than an Act passed in such an assembly to justify to the world and to posterity such an inhuman and unprecedented attempt. There remained yet for them to show that this Act was conformable to the constitution of the kingdom, at least to produce some instance or precedent of co-active power exercised by the nobles or states against any king of Scotland before King James III.; for if they could have found any such instance in the history of the Scots, they had infallibly alleged it in their Act, to justify their attempt in the eye of all Christendom, with the pope and other princes and states abroad, and with their fellow-subjects at home; and as in the very first occasion after the rebellion against King James III. and this Act made to justify it, and after the publishing Boece's history, with all the tragical examples of deposing power which he relates on the credit of his forged vouchers,—as in the very first occasion, I say, after all this that the Scots took arms against their sovereign, Queen Mary, they failed not to allege to the ambassadors of Queen Elizabeth, and of other foreign princes, for the justification of their action, the practice of their predecessors against her majesty's ancestors, and many precedents of former times, meaning those contained in Boece's vouchers, and the late one of King James III. So also that party of the Scottish nobility who had taken arms against King James III., and were masters of the young king's person, and of the Parliament they had obliged him to convocate, in order to acquit themselves and to prosecute those that had kept their allegiance to the late king, had not failed to have alleged some such precedent in former times had there been any such; and their not doing it at a juncture in which they were so hard put to it to justify their proceedings in their famous Act, is a plain proof that no such precedent was to be found in those days, and by consequence that none of those precedents set down

¹ See his life by Dr. Abercromby, in the second volume of the Scotish History.

by Boece, on the faith of his Veremund and other pretended vouchers, or any other of the like nature, had ever been as yet heard of ; and this fact confirms beyond reply the truth of the third argument, which I brought against Boece's history of the forty kings, and that his vouchers were not forged till after the death of King James III. and after this Act, 'Of the Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Striveling,' since it proves that all the principles and precedents of the deposing power contained in these vouchers were all new, and posterior to that time.

Now the lives and fortunes of that part of the nobility who had pursued to death the late king depending on the stability of this their Act, and this Act being in itself very precarious, and liable to be reversed if a change at court should fall out, and that the young king should happen to put himself into the hands of those that had given proof of their loyalty and attachment to the crown by their firm adhesion to the late king his father, and that he came to open daily more his eyes upon the guilt of the parricide in which the authors of this Act had engaged him, and so might, for reparation, execute upon them the laws against rebellion, as he had begun to punish himself for it, —affairs being in this state, and all the security of the adverse party to the late king depending on the stability of their new Act, and nothing being more necessary to fortify, propagate, and diminish the horror that posterity might conceive of their attempt than precedents of such like attempts in former ages, and none such being extant at that time in all the Scotish histories, it was of the last importance to the party, and very natural for some of their adherents, to invent histories fit for the purpose, to give them names and an air of antiquity, and carefully hide them till a proper season in some corner, so as they might easily be found out in due time by those who, being themselves ignorant of the artifice, as well as incapable of judging of ancient pieces, they were sure would not fail to proclaim their new discoveries everywhere as curious and valuable pieces of ancient history of the Scots, which had escaped the destruction made of them by King Edward I. of England; and so it happened.

These are, indeed, but conjectures ; but when all that hath been already said at length of the nature and contents of Vere-mund and these other pretended ancient pieces of the Scotish history, the circumstances of time, and the want in which the authors of the enterprise against King James III. were of precedents,—when all this is impartially considered, and that within a few years after this unprecedented Act, at least as soon as a proper season, such as the confusions of a new minority, was found, and a fit tool, that is, the most eloquent, and perhaps the most credulous, of the Scotish writers, to say nothing of his prin-

ciples concerning government,—when, I say, one meets with a whole new series of history, detailed into particulars never heard of before, wholly built upon new principles of government inconsistent with all the former histories and laws of the Scottish nation, exemplified in a great number of facts and instances of a power exercised by the Scottish nobles over their kings in ancient times, and this history hurried out in unusual haste, and producing nothing for its vouchers in the most incredible narrations but authors wholly unknown till then, appearing on a sudden from dark and remote corners, and suddenly disappearing again, and these absolutely inconsistent with all other ancient histories, foreign and domestic,—but especially when one finds that the first appearance of these pretended vouchers happened precisely at or about the times in which the factious party stood so much in need of precedents from ancient times of kings called to account by their subjects, what can be rationally thought of the whole, but that one of the chief views of the first authors of this contrivance was to justify the late tragedy of King James III. and the Act made to support it, to raise the power of the nobility or states and depress the majesty of kings, and to set up a tribunal on earth for him who by all former laws and histories was answerable for his administration to God alone ; and that all the ancient succession of kings in the Scottish line before Fergus II., and all those glorious pretended achievements that accompany this new scheme of history, were only designed to flatter the nation into a belief of it, and to make it go better down with the king and people ?

So that whoever will impartially consider the new principles and scheme of government contained in Boece's history, with the many instances it furnishes of the kings of Scotland called to an account and punished by their subjects for pretended maladministration, and compare that history with all the Scottish histories or chronicles written before the reign of King James III. (in none of which will be found so much as one instance of any such popular power either exercised or even claimed by the Scots over their sovereigns), will be forced to add to all the proofs we have already given of the forgery of Boece's vouchers this new one, and naturally conclude that all these pretended writers, on whose authority Boece built his history of the forty kings, are late inventions posterior to the death of King James III., designed only to serve a turn ; and so be convinced by a new proof, not only of the forgery of Vere-mund and his other vouchers, but of their being composed a little before Boece's own time, upon occasion of the rebellion against King James III., and the Act made to justify it.

Who the first authors of this forgery were is not, especially at this distance of time, to be guessed at; and, to be sure, be who they will, they took care to have this work of darkness so warily carried on as not be discovered. But it cannot be doubted but that the first contrivers have been some of these concerned in the factions against the government in these days, or dependents on them, who, like Annius of Viterbe, another famous impostor who lived at the same time, have in all appearance first forged upon John Fordun's chronicle new histories of Scotland under the names of Veremund, John Campbell, etc., and then conveyed them so cunningly to the place where they were found, and supposed to have been long preserved, that both the noblemen who sent them, and Boece who made use of them as copies of genuine records, were equally imposed upon.

But be this as it will, it is but too evident by the writers about that time, that partly by the power the states or nobles had assumed on occasion of the long minority of Kings James II., III., and V., and for the other reasons mentioned before, but especially on occasion of this Act to justify the rebellion against King James III., partly by the many bad examples which our neighbours of England had given in their wars against King John and King Henry III., in their conduct towards their Kings Edward II. and Richard II., as well as in the whole course of the contest betwixt the houses of Lancaster and York,—by all these occasions, I say, the respect for the persons and dignity of our kings was so generally diminished among the Scots towards the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth age, the spirit of rebellion and sedition raised to such a pitch, and the opinion of the power of the states and nobles (in itself so popular) had gained so much ground, that even very well-meaning men and otherwise learned were imbued with it.

Such were the notions of John Major,¹ as appears by his scholastic reasonings on the right of King Robert Bruce to the crown, in his history published some four or five years before that of Boece; such were also those of Hector Boece himself, who, though the account he gave to the public how he came by his vouchers screens him in a great measure from being suspected to have contrived them himself, yet he had never so confidently delivered the principles and facts he relates against the sovereignty of the kings of Scotland in ancient times, had he not been already in some measure tainted with them, as we have already observed.

And thus far as to Hector Boece and his history of the first forty kings. It remains now to examine that of Buchanan, after I have first given an account of the histories of the first

¹ Joan. Maj. fol. 78.

forty kings as they are set down by Bishop Lesly and David Chambers, who in order of time were the first that wrote the history of Scotland after Boece, and some years before Buchanan; and all of them wrote on Boece's plan, and copied from him.

ART. III.—*Of John Lesly, Bishop of Ross, and his History of Scotland.*

John Lesly, bred at Aberdeen, finished his studies in the University of Paris, where, having taken the degree of licentiate of the laws, he was chosen one of the procurators, A.D. 1553, and after having passed doctor of the laws, returned home, and was made official of Aberdeen, A.D. 1560. He was one of those that came to Edinburgh from that university to defend the ancient religion against the new Reformers, and in the year following was sent over to France by a party of the nobility to invite Queen Mary home, A.D. 1566. He was chosen one of the lords of the session and of the privy council by the queen, and named by her majesty to the bishopric of Ross, A.D. 1568; he was one of the chief of the commissioners for the queen in the conferences held at York and London against Murray and his party, and continued afterwards her majesty's ambassador at the English court four or five years, the two last of which he was kept prisoner by Queen Elizabeth, and at last got leave to go to France, where he arrived in January 1574. He went afterwards, first to Germany, then to Rome, to promote the queen his sovereign's cause, and solicit at the Imperial court the restitution of the Scottish monasteries. He was consecrated bishop at Rome, and published his history of Scotland, dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII., who was at the expense of printing it, and of the cuts of the king's genealogies and of the map of Scotland; it was published in the beginning of the year 1578. From Rome he returned back to Germany, continuing his negotiations for his sovereign and his country, and obtained that same year, 1578, an edict of the Emperor Rodolph for re-establishing the Scottish monasteries. From thence he came back to France, where he was for some years suffragan to the archbishop of Rouen till Queen Mary's death, after which he went into Flanders. He died at Brussels, A.D. 1596.

As to his history of Scotland, having been (as we have seen) all along, till the time that he published it, continually in public business, negotiations, or voyages, he had very little leisure to compose a history, except during the last two years he was in England in prison. And in effect¹ he informs us himself

¹ ‘Seotorum historiam, quam in carcere radiorem informaram, indeque tanquam naufragii tabulam in Italiam importaram; texendam seu potius a prin-

that it was during that imprisonment that he compiled it in a rude draft, and polished it afterwards during the abode he made at Rome, which could not be long, since he calls it some months (*his mensibus*¹). So that the circumstances in which he wrote would alone engage us not to look upon it as a work of much time and discussion, nor take strictly in the literal sense what he says in his preface to his countrymen of his consulting upon his history, and comparing it with the annals² kept in the royal archives of Scotland, with the books of Pasly, Scoon, and other monastery books, which those that have seen what remain of these books, and have examined Bishop Lesly's history, may be apt to take it for a bare flourish of rhetoric, in order to grace his performance with strangers; but I would rather interpret his expression as meaning only that he had formerly seen before his leaving Scotland some of these monuments of history, as a curious man is apt to do, but that after many years spent in public negotiations and troubles, he had no distinct memory of them in particular, else to be sure he had never mentioned them as a standard of his history, unless he means that he had seen them at second-hand,—that is, in the only original he had to follow in foreign countries, or under confinement, and which it is evident he followed *verbatim*—to wit, the history of Boece, whom he no doubt supposed had perused them.

And to prove that Bishop Lesly's history, especially that part of it which relates to the first forty kings contained in his first three books, which is all of it in which I am at present concerned, was not founded upon the chronicles of Scoon, Pasly, or our monastery books, there needs no more but to remember what we have already often observed, that those chronicles, and all our monastery books that have yet appeared, are really mere copies of Fordun. As to the story of the forty or forty-five kings before Fergus, the son of Erch, called Fergus II., and, indeed, as to all the Scottish history till King David I.'s death, and then compare Lesly's history of the first forty kings on the one hand with Fordun's accounts of them, and on the other with those of Boece, and it will plainly appear that Bishop Lesly's is a bare abridgment of Boece,—even in the most incredible stories,—and differs no less than Boece does from Fordun's accounts of these first kings, and by consequence from all our ancient monastery books.

cipio denuo retexendam qua potui diligentia curavi.'—*Epist. dedic. ad Greg. P. XIII. p. 7.*

¹ 'Foetum hunc non tam meum Scoticumne, quam Romanam etsi a nobis antea conceptus Romæ tamen *his mensibus* (maxime editus adolevit)', etc.—*Epist. dedic. ad Card. Sermonettam Scotiæ protector. p. 3.*

² *Parenes. ad nobil. & pop. Scot. p. 14.*

And, indeed, that is all that could be expected in those days from one in Bishop Lesly's circumstances, who, having no leisure from his constant employments at home, and no opportunity in his prisons, voyages, and negotiations abroad, to compile a new history from what remains there were of our ancient monastery books, and finding also Boece's history generally received in those days as the standard of our history, but that the prolixity of it made it tedious to the readers,¹ he thought the best service he could do to his country was to abridge it, by retrenching what seemed superfluous, retaining still the same body of history and all that seemed substantial in it; but I conceive it may be presumed of a person of Bishop Lesly's character, loyalty, and good sense, that if his affairs and circumstances had allowed him the leisure and conveniency of examining Boece's history, upon what remained of Fordun and his continuators, and upon the accounts that the Roman and ancient British writers give of the northern parts of Britain, he would have made great alterations in Boece's history of the first forty kings, both as to the facts related and as to the principles of government it is built upon. What is, then, truly valuable in Bishop Lesly's history, is that part of it which is properly his own, where he is guided by his own lights, and not by those of Boece, especially the accounts which he gives of transactions in Scotland from the death of King James v. till Queen Mary's return to Scotland, A.D. 1561. And as to his true principles on monarchical government, and on the independency of sovereigns of all except God alone, the curious may find them proved from Scripture in a writing² he gave in to Queen Elizabeth, the 4th of March 1570-71.

ART. IV.—*Of David Chambers of Ormond, his Abridgment of the Scotish History, and Citations from Veremund.*

David Chambers of Ormond was one of the lords of the session in Queen Mary's time, and being afterwards banished his country, came to Paris about the year 1571. He wrote an abridgment of the history of the popes, emperors, kings of France and Scotland, which he dedicated first to King Charles IX., A.D. 1572, and afterwards, with new editions, to King Henry III., A.D. 1579. It is of this last edition that I made use. His history of Scotland, which was his chief view, is a bare abridg-

¹ ‘Multi & exteri & nostri mihi fuerunt authores—ut anteactæ etatis historiam quam Joan. Major verâ sed non satis ornata & Hect. Boetius ornata, sed non satis pressa oratione (ut nonnulli queruntur) explicarat, arctius comprimerem’.—*Lesl. parœnis, ad Scot.* p. 14, edit. Rom.

² Cotton Library, Caligula, c. 1, fol. 51.

ment of that of Hector Boece, even in the most unaccountable stories of the first forty kings.

What is particular in Chambers is, that he tells us that he himself, as well as Boece, had seen the famous Veremund and Boece's other vouchers. At first, one would be apt to believe that he had seen them only, as no doubt the English historian Baker (who sets them down among his vouchers) saw them, at second-hand, and only in Boece. But Chambers,¹ quoting in particular Veremund's own words from his epistle dedicatory to Malcolm Keanmore, and in another place² the second book of Veremund's history (which are particulars that Boece does not make mention of),—these citations, I say, seem to put it out of doubt (1) that there was really extant a compilation of Scotish history in the beginning of the sixteenth age that bore the name of Veremund, which Boece and David Chambers both must have seen and perused; (2) that what the learned Gordon³ of Straloch heard of Boece's destroying Veremund, with other vouchers of his history, must be a mistake.

But let this be as it will, these two particular citations of Chambers from Veremund do both serve for a further conviction that this pretended Veremund's history was a fabulous invention of latter ages. The first passage contains a copy of the first French and Scotish league betwixt Charlemagne and King Achajus, A.D. 792. And of this league Chambers pretends to give us from his Veremund the articles in their proper terms,⁴ bearing a mutual obligation on both nations to assist one another against the English, who, this league supposes, had then wars with the French as ordinarily as in the fifteenth age.

Now, in the first place, though there are proofs that Charlemagne entertained friendship with the king of Scots as he did with other neighbouring princes, yet it is certain on the one hand, that the heptarchy subsisting yet in England, their own divisions left no room for their amoying France, especially under such a powerful prince as Charlemagne; nor do we find that ever they attempted it till they had a settled interest to maintain in France after the Norman Conquest, so there was not the least occasion for the Scots going to the French assistance when attacked by the English; and even Chambers him-

¹ Hist. de D. Chambres, fol. 228.

² Ibid. fol. 95.

³ Nicolson. Scot. hist. library, p. 75.

⁴ ‘La teneur de l'alliance perpetuelle amitié, etc. L'injure des Anglois, ou force de leurs armes levées contre l'un desdits François ou Escossois, sera commune & repoussée par tous les deux. Les François étant persecutez de guerre par les Anglois, le Roy d'Escosse luy fournira de soldats aux depens du Roy de France. Les Escossois étant provoquez par les Anglois seront aidez & secourus par les François a leurs fraix & depens,’ etc.—*D. Chamb.* fol. 95, 96, from Veremund.

self is forced to own in other places that there was no need of this mutual succour till about three or four hundred years after this. And so it is evident that the true Veremund (if ever there was such a man), living under King Malcolm III., and writing, as we are told, A.D. 1076, could never have advanced that the kings of France and Scotland had made in the year 792, about three hundred years before, a league offensive and defensive against the English, since he could not be ignorant that it was scarce full ten years since the English, having acquired by William the Conqueror possessions in France, began for the first time to have occasion of war with the French; but a writer of the fifteenth or sixteenth age personating Veremund was not obliged to know so much.

On the other hand, the Scots in those early times were in no posture to assist France, much less to send over to it 4000 men, as Chambers tells us that King Achajus sent them under his brother Willerm (a way of spelling the name Willelmus or William never in use till the fifteenth century), or Gilmer, as others call him, for this was in the end of the eighth age, when the kingdom of the Scots in Britain was as yet confined to the western coasts of Albany,—the whole eastern coast, from the utmost bounds of the north to Northumberland, being still under the dominion of the Picts,¹ whose monarchy subsisted in their own name about forty years after this; so the Scots could have no correspondence with France, nor send them forces, but what must have passed through the Pictish or Saxon territories.

In the second place, these articles of the league, which Chambers says he had from Veremund, confirm what is proved elsewhere,² that the compilation of Scottish history, attributed to Veremund, was the work of an author of the fifteenth age or thereabout. For the terms in which Chambers cites from his Veremund the articles of this league are the very same in substance, and almost the formal expressions, that we find in the copies of the leagues betwixt the French and Scots in the fourteenth and fifteenth age, and visibly borrowed from them.

As to the real league itself betwixt France and Scotland, there is no doubt but it was one of the most ancient in Europe, observed for many ages without any interruption, and with the greatest fidelity by both nations. And we have to this day a continued series or tract of these leagues, renewed in every reign till the union of the Scotish and English crowns, from the reign of Robert the Bruce, in whose alliance with Charles le Bel it is said to have subsisted a long time before;³ and as to

¹ *Supra*, pp. 61, 62, et.

² *Supra*, p. 146, etc.

³ ‘*L'amitie & bien-voillance qad esté de longe temps entre nos predecessours*

the beginning of it in Charlemagne's time, before Hector Boece and Chambers, it is, indeed, mentioned by Fordun,¹ and by all our monastery books that continued him down, but they mention it only in general as a tradition (*ut traditur*), and they allege that the occasion of it was only that the English or Saxons exercised piracy sometimes on the coast of France, which surely required no need of sending forces from Scotland to France, as the articles of the league that Chambers relates from Veremund expressly bear; nor is there, indeed, any word of the articles at all, or of Veremund himself, to be met with in Fordun or any of his continuators,—and no wonder, for neither these particulars, nor the Veremund from which they are taken, were as yet invented.

As to the second passage, related by Chambers² as taken *verbatim* from his Veremund, the simple reading of it may suffice to convince any man skilled in the accounts of the ancient state of the north of Britain that the author of that compilation under Veremund's name was one of the most arrant forgers that ever wrote. Here is the passage itself translated from Chambers' own account:—‘Veremund, a Spaniard, in the epistle dedicatory of his book of the histories of Scotland, which he dedicated to Malcolm III., the eighty-sixth king, in the year 1076, writes in the following words: “Although,” says Vere-mund, “there be many things contained in the said histories (of Scotland) which perhaps might seem to the readers somewhat difficult to be believed, since they are not wholly confirmed or attested by foreign historians, yet,” says he, “when they shall have considered that the Scots are situated in the northern parts of the island of Albion, and by consequence very rarely frequented by strangers, which might give them occasion to write their actions; and when they shall have also heard that the Scots were not less happy, having almost always had, before the times of Christianity, the Druids, a religious people, for diligent chroniclers, and always (since they received Christianity) religious men, faithful historiographers, since they had the Isles of Man and Ycolmkill, impregnable places, where they preserved securely their monuments and antiquities, without giving any copies of them, or even letting them be seen by strangers,—all this considered,” says he, “they will cease to wonder that foreign writers say little or nothing of the Scottish antiquities.”’ Thus Veremund.

This, indeed, is an invention worthy of such an author, which,

roys de France, & nostre royalme & les roys & ledit royalme d'Escosse encontre le roy d'Engleterre. *Confederacion entre les roys Charles le Bel & Robert de Brus, en 1326.*

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, c. 47.

² Chambers, fol. 228, 229.

if it were admitted of, would alone suffice to screen from censure or criticism all the cheats or forgers of old writings that ever were or may be. But to let the story of the Scotish chronicles pass, which are pretended to have been written in the times of paganism by these religious Druids (though not one of the many authors that have given full accounts of them and of their manners ever reckoned writing of history among their institutions), one may evidently see in this passage that this author, who assumed the name of Veremund, wrote with a formed design to impose on his credulous readers, and at the same time with the precaution of a man who, conscious to himself of forgery, foresaw his writings would be suspected as containing matters wholly new and never heard of in the world before. To prevent, therefore, this so obvious a suspicion, he is careful to inform us that these Druids, and after them the monks of Ycolmkill, guardians of those ancient annals of the Scots, made a great secret of them, and did not communicate them, or so much as let them be seen by any stranger; so no wonder if the ancient Roman or British writers make not the least mention of the noble feats they contained.

But not to ask this author many obvious questions as to what became of these annals, and how they were preserved when Ycolmkill was frequently burnt, and the abbots and monks slain, in the ninth and tenth age by the Danes passing to and from Ireland; and supposing for a moment that the Scots had been in old times endued with that surprising modesty and self-denial, without example in all other countries, as to hide and conceal from all the rest of the world, down to Veremund's and Boece's time, all that ancient, glorious succession of kings, and those martial achievements performed in the highest antiquity, as Boece and Chambers pretend to have copied from Vere-mund; and allowing also that the then ancient annals of the Scots might have been kept in the dark during the first three or four hundred years of the Scotish monarchy, before the Romans entered Britain, and before they had any intercourse with the northern Britains, in which case, indeed, we are not to expect any accounts of the Scots in those early times from the Roman or British writers,—was it equally in the power of these keepers of the archives of Ycolmkill to conceal the Scotish achievements against the Romans since the coming in of the Romans to Britain, if it be true that the Scots had frequent battles and treaties with them, even from Julius Cæsar and Augustus' time, and made such a figure in Britain as Boece and Chambers have it from Veremund, and that for more than three hundred years, down till the middle of the fourth age? To pass over the contradiction of the Scots making so long such

a figure, and not being taken notice of, was it, I say, in their annalist's power to keep the Scots all these ages so unseen and unheard of, that not one of all the ancient Roman writers before Ammian Marcellin, such as Tacitus, Dio, Herodian, and others, who give us details of the transactions or wars betwixt the Romans and the inhabitants of North Britain, should ever have once mentioned the Scots ; nor any of the ancient geographers, Strabo, Mela, Ptolemy, or Solinus, in their descriptions of the northern as well as southern Britains, should so much as once have named them ?

At this rate, it would seem that the whole race of ancient Scotish kings, the whole people, the kingdom itself, and their actions in peace and war, must have been as carefully kept secret during six or seven hundred years by these trusty guardians of the archives of Ycolmkill as the annals themselves ; or rather, who does not see that this invention of unknown and unseen annals and histories for so many ages is all a contradiction, and an ill-contrived artifice to screen the forgery of Vere-mund ?

All I shall say to conclude is, that it is a great advantage to truth that the most part of the forgers of pretended old writings were, by the permission of Providence, generally so extremely ignorant, and frequently of so little sense and judgment, that even almost in every passage of their inventions one may discover anachronisms, contradictions, and other marks of their forgery.

And this is all that needs be said of David Chambers' history of the first forty Scotish kings, which, being but an abridgment of that of Boece, and built on the same authorities, must stand or fall with it.

But this does not hinder David Chambers' abridgment, it being otherwise useful to history in more modern times ; nor his being himself a person of merit, both for his rank in the state, his travels, and sufferings in the service of Queen Mary, his lawful sovereign.

ART. V.—*Of George Buchanan's account of the first Forty Kings of the Scots in Britain.*

SEC. I.—*The Introduction to Buchanan's History. The Progress of the Doctrine of the Deposing Power in Scotland.*

Before I enter upon the particular discussion of Buchanan's history, it is necessary, by way of introduction to it, to continue down the account of the progress and further steps that the notions of a power lodged in the subjects to judge and depose

their sovereigns made in Scotland in the interval betwixt the time of the publishing the history of Boece, A.D. 1526, and that of Buchanan, A.D. 1582.

The long and tumultuous minority of King James v., who was only one year and five months old when he came to the crown, contributed not a little to fortify and spread the notion of the power of the nobility in the administration of the government, which during near twenty years was in their hands, excepting the short interval of the regency of the Duke of Albany; so that King James, a prince of a high spirit, as soon as he came at age, thought himself obliged to use all his endeavours to recover the prerogative, and by consequence to restrain the overgrowing power of the nobility. Thus we see that in his first Parliament¹ after his majority, the ancient style of the Acts of Parliament, which had been long out of use, is resumed, and they generally run thus:—‘Our sovereign lord ordains,’ etc.; or, ‘our sovereign lord, with advice and consent of the prelates, barons, etc., ordains,’ etc. And as to the nobility, it is thought by some that King James v. carried his resentments and resolution to humble them too far, or at least that he went too fast on in that design, and did not act with such caution as the temper of the people with whom he had to do did require. So he died in the struggle.

By his death the crown falling again into a minority, and that of a woman, and the divisions of the state, occasioned by the emissaries and pensioners of England, and by the new opinions about religion, running higher than ever, the popular power made a new progress. And to confirm the matter, the levelling doctrines introduced by the first Scottish Reformers, trained up all of them in the republican Geneva principles, infected not only the nobility, but the commons; so that whereas hitherto all the commotions that had happened in the kingdom, and the revolts against the sovereign, had been the effect of the factions of the nobility alone, without the commons having ever had any other share in rebellion than by blindly following the great men on whom they depended, it is very remarkable that from the time the Scots drank the cup of the levelling Geneva doctrine, and never till then, the commons began to draw into factions by themselves, convocated by the ministers, and having them or some of their zealots among the nobility incited by them at their head; and the commons being once persuaded by these new doctors that monarchy had its first origin from the people’s election of kings, and that all kings and magistrates were originally the people’s creatures, they doubted not but they had still an equal power to depose or reform them as at first to create them.

¹ 4 Parl. Jac. v. an. 1535.

It is no less remarkable that till the times of this Reformation all rebellions in Scotland had proceeded from the private discontents and factions of some of the nobility, grown too powerful for the crown, or combining together by associations against it ; and that in all the history of Scotland, till the Reformers came in, it was never heard of that either the pretence of religion or the ancient clergy had ever any share in rebellions, much less were the churchmen the trumpeters of it; but that on the contrary they always used all their endeavours (witness the conduct of the Bishops Kenedy and Elphinston) to pacify commotions, and to compose any differences that happened betwixt the sovereign and the subjects; and when factions grew too high to be quelled by their mediation, the church's revenues were always at the king's disposal to enable him to suppress rebellion by the authority given him by God. But from the time that the Scottish Reformation set up, rebellion put on for the first time the mask of religion, and had some of the first Scottish Reformers for the incendiaries of it, and their false glosses and interpretations of the Holy Scripture the incentives ; and so it became more common, and more successful than ever before.

It was, then, mainly under the cloak of religion and reformation that this spirit of revolt against the higher powers was first industriously infused and deeply rooted in the hearts of many of the Scottish commons and nobility, by the vehement invectives of John Knox and others of the first doctors of the Reformation, against the then governing powers, chiefly for these reasons,—that they remained firm and constant in the ancient religion, and would not repeal the laws and acts made in the time of their ancestors to support it. Upon that ground it was that those new doctors went about persuading the people by wrested texts of Scripture that when the supreme magistrate or sovereign refused or demurred to suppress the religion established by law (which they called idolatry), or continued to countenance it, in that case the nobles or commons were obliged either to compel their sovereign to abolish it, or take arms and do it themselves, whether their sovereign would or not. This is the purport of two of the first blasts of the famous John Knox's trumpet of rebellion,—to wit, of his appellation to the nobility, A.D. 1555, and admonition to the commonalty of Scotland, A.D. 1558, which are printed both at length at the end of the edition of his history in folio and in quarto.

In consequence of this doctrine, during the regency of the queen who was mother to Queen Mary, several nobles and commons, stirred up by the violent declamations of these Reformers, combined together by oaths and leagues of mutual defence, under the title of the *Congregation*, and resolved to carry

on the alteration of religion by open violence in case that the queen regent should refuse to yield to their demands, and abolish the old religion, and give way to their innovations. Accordingly, upon the queen regent's opposing their new doctrine, they first took up arms against her, and having entered into league against the government with England, they obtained men and money from Queen Elizabeth for carrying on the rebellion; and not contented with that, they proceeded to depose the queen, mother to their sovereign, from the regency.

What is very remarkable in their proceedings to depose the queen regent, or, as they called it, to suspend her from the exercise of the regency, is, first, that notwithstanding the progress that the antimonarchical principles had made, especially by the seditious preachings and writings of Knox and others of the first Reformers, and though they were actually in arms against the government, yet the depriving the queen of the regency committed to her by the queen her daughter, their sovereign, and confirmed by Act of Parliament, the depriving her without authority of one or other was a thing so new and so unprecedented in all former history, that the Lords of the Congregation themselves demurred upon the point, and before they would venture to go on with it, thought it necessary to consult the two leading ministers of the Congregation, Knox and Willocks, who were looked upon by them as oracles, and who both of them unanimously gave their judgment for the lawfulness of that proceeding; upon which decision the Lords of the Congregation, who by all the laws then in being had no other character but that of private subjects, and those rebels too, took upon them to deprive the queen, mother to their sovereign, of the administration of the government.

Another thing remarkable in their depriving the queen regent is the authority by which they profess to do it, to wit, 'in the name¹ and by the authority (as their Act bears) of their sovereign lord [Francis, king of France and of Scotland] and of their sovereign lady [Queen Mary, daughter to the queen regent].' That is, in plain terms, they make use of the name and authority of the king and queen to deprive the queen regent from acting by their authority, and endeavouring to execute their majesties' express orders, towards maintaining the ancient standing religion and opposing the new Reformation, towards suppressing open rebellion against their authority, and for her withholding their destroying and ruining all the glorious monuments of the piety of the ancient kings and nobility of Scotland all over the kingdom, without sparing even the ashes and sepulchres of their

¹ Knox, Hist. p. 195.

royal predecessors ; and especially for her making use of the auxiliaries sent from France by their majesties themselves to her aid against the rebels, to execute those their commissions. These were the crimes for which the oracles of the Scottish Reformation judged the queen regent worthy to be deprived of her authority, and for which the Lords of the Congregation made use of the name and authority of the king and queen to deprive her ; and this is the first time I find the name and authority of the king made use of to deprive or oppose those acting by his commission.

Archbishop Spotswood with good reason condemns this bold decision of Knox and Willocks,¹ and their abusing the Holy Scripture to countenance it ; and no wonder, for he lived to see the dismal effects of this doctrine by men of the same principles carrying on a rebellion against a Protestant king [Charles I.], and deposing and banishing the Protestant bishops, and himself at the head of them, and that, too, on the same principles, with an equal show of Scripture texts interpreted by themselves.

But to proceed : the Lords of the Congregation having obtained considerable forces by sea and land, with money to pay their own troops from England, and the queen regent being dead, chiefly of grief, in the castle of Edinburgh, they got the better of the loyal party, and a treatise ensued at Leith,² which was favourable to the Reformers, by the influence of Queen Elizabeth and of Montluc, the French ambassador in Scotland, whom all the world knows was then, though a bishop, but a very lewd one, a great favourer of the Reformers. However, this treatise was never ratified by Queen Mary.³ Soon after, in August 1560, the kingdom being now in confusion, a tumultuous assembly, chiefly composed of the favourers of the new religion, met at Edinburgh ; and though they had no commission nor authority from king or queen, the articles of the treatise at Leith not being ratified, they called themselves a Parliament, and took upon them an authority and jurisdiction superior to all our Parliaments that ever were, by rescinding at once all the laws and acts that had been made in Scotland in favour of the religion established by all our ancient Parliaments since these assemblies were in being, and by all our ancient kings since Christianity was first planted in Scotland.

But the zeal of the first Reformers did not stop at the overturning religion, but struck directly at the right of monarchy and at the person of the sovereign, by putting in execution this new maxim of state, which became the chief foundation of the Reformation in Scotland : ‘ That when the king or sovereign was an idolater, a murtherer,’ etc. (of which they sustained themselves

¹ Spotswood, p. 136.

² Knox, pp. 251, 252.

³ Spotswood.

judges), ‘God’s people [the subjects that embraced the Reformation] not only might, but ought to execute God’s judgments upon him, according to God’s law, and punish him, not as a king, but as an offender.’ This was the common doctrine of Knox and his associates, the pillars of the Scottish Reformation, and was maintained with the greatest assurance as a Scripture doctrine by the same John Knox and others of them against secretary Lethington, in a long conference of twenty pages, which may be seen in Knox’s history.¹ It was in consequence of this doctrine that Queen Mary their sovereign was thrown into prison, deprived of her royal authority, forced to resign her kingdom to an infant of thirteen months old, by which the whole exercise of the regal power might be conveyed to Murray and Morton, the leading men among this godly people; and it was to justify these proceedings against the sovereign to posterity, and to make these principles of government pass for the ancient constitution of the kingdom and the right of the Scottish monarchy, that Buchanan first published his dialogue, *De jure regni apud Scotos*, and afterwards his history to support it, as we are now to show more at length.

SEC. II.—*Of M. George Buchanan; of his Writings against his Sovereign, Mary Queen of Scotland.*

M. George Buchanan was born in Lennox, about the year of our Lord 1506. After his first studies in Scotland he came to Paris, whence after two years he went home again and studied philosophy at St. Andrews. He came back to Paris A.D. 1527, and upon proof of his being made bachelor of arts in the University of St. Andrews, he was, according to the privilege our Scottish universities enjoyed in those times in Paris, admitted to the same degree in that university, and commenced master of arts in April 1528, and in June 1530 he was elected one of the four procurators. The rest of his life, till he returned to Scotland during Queen Mary’s reign, may be seen done by himself among his works, and continued on lately by Sir Robert Sibbald and Mr. Ruddiman, to whom I must refer the reader for the high elogiums which all the best judges of prose and of verse in Buchanan’s time, and ever since, have deservedly made of his elegant Latin style, and of his incomparable vein of poesy; in both which kinds of literature he seems to have surpassed all that came before him since the decay of the purity of the Latin tongue, and perhaps all that have written since. It had been happy for his own memory and for his country if he had kept himself within these his proper talents, and not meddled with

¹ Knox, Hist. from p. 377 to p. 397, edit. in fol.

politics, of which he could have no great experience, never having been bred to them, nor in any public business till he was past threescore years of age. And, indeed, it was a very surprising thing to wise and moderate men to see a private man, who had never been in any employment of the state, but had spent most of his years in colleges or private families teaching youth, or in reading and forming his style in prose and verse on classical authors, set up all on a sudden for a statesman, capable to give lessons of politics, and form new schemes of the government of states and monarchies, which is the subject of his book *De jure regni*, in which, says the learned Straloch, ‘forgetting himself, he treats of such matters as require the pen of the best divine and most skilful lawyer,’ as well as of the most experienced statesman.

And as to his talent in history, I mean that of ancient times, this requiring great knowledge of antiquity and critical learning, the two first books of his history of Scotland furnish us with a proof that he had applied himself to these studies, and was for those times more than ordinarily versed in them; and if with that he had been more free of prejudices and of the spirit of party, less addicted to Platonic schemes of government of his own forming, and had found good vouchers and been exact to follow them, his fluent and copious Latin style would have rendered him more capable than any in his time to write the ancient history of his country with advantage.

But if we may depend upon the character given of him by one of his friends that knew him well, and lived familiarly with him, I mean Sir James Melvil, no man was more unfit than Buchanan for giving us a true account or history of his own time, especially in his old age, when he set about it. Buchanan, says this writer,¹ was a stoic philosopher, who looked not far before him; a man of notable endowments for his learning and knowledge in Latin poesy, much honoured in other countries, etc. But he was easily abused; and so facile, that he was led by every company that he haunted, which made him factious in his old days, for he spoke and wrote as those who were about him. He was become careless, following in many things the vulgar opinion. He was naturally popular, and extremely revengeful against any man who had offended him, which was his greatest fault. To this my author adds two instances of his passionate revengeful humour. It was necessary to take notice here of this character given of Buchanan by one that knew him so well, for we shall soon see the effects of it, especially of his credulity and passionate humour; and all the accounts that he hath left us of what passed in Scotland in his own time are new

¹ Melvil's Memoirs, p. 125.

confirmations of it, especially what he wrote against Queen Mary.

That princess, who was herself a notable proficient in learning, and a great encourager of men of letters, had always, both abroad and at home, protected and favoured Buchanan. Among other gifts, she bestowed upon him, A.D. 1564, the temporal revenue of the abbey of Crosraguel; and for the particular esteem that she had of his capacity, she invited him home to Scotland, as he informs us,¹ in order to trust him with the education of the prince her son, A.D. 1565, even before the child was born. Accordingly, Buchanan had always extolled that princess with the greatest elogiums; witness his dedication of his psalms, *Nympha Caledonieæ*, and others. But as soon as she fell into adversity, a sacrifice to the ambition of her base brother, the Prior of St. Andrews, whom she had created Earl of Murray, and who had been Buchanan's pupil, he changed his note, and from being a great admirer of that illustrious princess, his sovereign and benefactrix, he became her mortal enemy, having contributed more than could have been expected of one of his low rank to her deposition from her royal dignity, having joined those that aimed at her life, and having afterwards with a pen dipped in vinegar and gall done all that lay in his power to ruin her reputation, which was dearer to her than her life. Now as his libel, *De jure regni apud Scotos*, was chiefly designed to justify the rebellious proceedings of her subjects against that queen, and his history calculated to support that libel, it seems necessary, in order to put this in a better light, and lay open the grounds of Buchanan's history, to say something here of the cause of that injured princess, and of the misfortunes that befell her.

Queen Mary was firm in the religion of her ancestors; and though at her return home to Scotland, by the persuasion of her base brother the prior (into whose hands, at her first coming, she had the misfortune to resign herself), and by the apprehension of a new rebellion from the zealots of the Knoxian party who beset her, she had been prevailed upon to leave matters of religion in the state she found them, and had even been led on to prosecute those that were the best disposed and the most capable to maintain her authority, and a liberty of conscience for those of her own persuasion, to wit, the family of Huntly; yet the Knoxian party was not able to persuade her to confirm the change of religion by Act of Parliament, or to establish the new religion by law, partly because of her aversion to force her subjects' consciences, and to give way to a legal prosecution of those of her own persuasion, and partly because, by degrees,

¹ Buchan. in vita sua.

as she came to be better informed of the state of the country and of the spirit of that party, by their insolent and seditious declamations, and the boldness they had, especially Knox, in spite of all the laws, to send out their circular letters, and make a convocation of the lieges to execute their fiery resolutions, the queen perceived that they drove on, as well at the ruin of monarchy in the state, by rendering the regal authority precarious, as they had ruined hierarchy in the church ; so she began to be more on her guard with them, and not so liberal in her concessions.

This increased their hatred against her, looking on their religion as unsecure as long as the queen's authority was acknowledged, or that she herself was alive or at liberty ; for however moderate she was in matters of religion in her own nature, her being descended by her mother of the house of Loraine and of Guise, and the bare name of Queen Mary, because of Queen Mary of England, made her odious and dreadful to the blind zealots ; and what the Earl of Kent said openly to her at Fodringhay the night before she suffered,— ‘Thy life will be the death of our religion, and thy death will be the life of it,’¹—was all along, during all the course of her life, the secret sentiments of all the zealots of the Puritan party in Britain. As to the moderate Protestants, it is very well known she was highly respected by them, and had a considerable party for her even in England ; but whoever will impartially consider the whole tract of contradictions and misfortunes that attended her from the time that Henry II., king of France, her father-in-law, engaged her with her husband, King Francis, to assume the arms of England after the death of Queen Mary, and especially from her return to Scotland till her death, will easily discover that her attachment to the religion of her ancestors, the jealousy of Queen Elizabeth, and the ambition of Murray and Morton, were the real sources from whence originally they all proceeded.

Everybody knows that these two lords, Murray and Morton, were the chief opposers of the queen's marriage with the Lord Darnley, Murray openly taking arms with others his associates, and Morton secretly and by craft ; and when the marriage was consummated in spite of them, and Murray was forced for his rebellion to fly into England, the next care of Morton, who remained at home, was to sow division betwixt the queen and her husband by inspiring that young, inexperienced prince with the barbarous design of murdering her secretary Riccio in her own presence, whilst she was big with child.

Here follows a short account of that villany, taken from

¹ ‘Tua vita exitium erit nostræ religionis, ut contra tuum exitium ejusdem erit vita.’—*Camden. vit. Eliz.* p. 455, edit. fol.

letters of the time. To prevent the attainder of Murray and of his accomplices, which was intended in the ensuing Parliament, Morton, Lindsay, Ruthven, and others, their friends, addressed themselves to King Henry, entreating him for Murray, promising him the matrimonial crown if he would follow their advice; and in order to that, they persuaded him to concur with them to destroy David Riccio, as being the chief obstacle, by his counsel to the queen, of his obtaining the matrimonial crown, and a greater share in the authority and administration. By these insinuations they persuaded this young, inexperienced, and ambitious nobleman not only to forget all the ties of honour, allegiance, and gratitude to his sovereign, who had preferred him to so many great princes that had courted her, but to commit the basest treachery, and hazard all at once the life of the queen his spouse and of the child in her womb (she being now about six months gone), by murdering her servant in her own presence, whereas they had daily occasion to do it in twenty other places. Upon this writs were drawn up and mutually signed by this imprudent prince and the conspirators; and accordingly, on Saturday night, the 9th of March, the queen being at supper with the Countess of Argyle, they possessed themselves of the palace, entered into the queen's closet, King Henry leading the way, threatened the queen, and barbarously murdered her servant Riccio.

Meantime, they make the queen prisoner in her own palace; but she having opened to her husband the danger to which they were both exposed by this plot, they escaped both in disguise to Dunbar, and the country being acquainted, did assemble in defence of the queen, who returned to Edinburgh, and Morton, with the other conspirators, fled to England. The chief design of this conspiracy was to alienate the queen's affection from her husband, which King Henry perceiving, conceived a mortal hatred against Murray and Morton, who had involved him in this misfortune; this again produced an equal hatred in them against King Henry, which ended in his murder, Murray joining with Bothwell to get home Morton, and all three aiming at the king's destruction for different ends; —Murray and Morton out of a hatred to his person, and an ambitious desire to have the ruling of the kingdom; and Bothwell, a vainglorious man, being put in hopes that if by any means the king was taken off, he might be divorced from his lady, and married to the queen.

Bothwell,¹ blinded with ambition and with the hopes suggested to him, undertook the crime, and most villainously committed the murder. Murray slipped off the day before, that

¹ Camden, p. 115.

he might not be suspected, but that the whole suspicion might fall upon the queen; and to augment it, as soon as he came back to court he and others of them that were in the plot began to commend Bothwell to the queen for the splendour of his family, his valour in expeditions against the English, and his singular fidelity to the crown, and represented him to her as the most proper person that she could make choice of to be her husband. They suggested at the same time that she alone would never be able to bear the weight of the affairs of the kingdom, to appease tumults and seditions; that it was therefore most expedient for her to pitch upon Bothwell for a husband, and to be partner of her counsels and dangers, he being a man who was able, willing, and daring enough to encounter them.

By these discourses,¹ and the constant proofs of fidelity that Bothwell had given to the queen her mother when almost all the rest of the nobility abandoned her, and by those he had given to herself, this desolate princess, not yet recovered of the fright of two murders,—the one, of her servant, committed in her own presence; the other, of her husband, some hours after she had been with him,—knowing none that she could trust with her safety preferable to Bothwell, at last promised to consider of it, but with this proviso: in the first place, that a due care should be had of the safety of the prince her son; 2d, that Bothwell should be purged in due form of law from all suspicion of the king her husband's murder; 3d, that he should be legally declared free from all engagement of his former marriage.

The next application² of those conspirators was to get Bothwell declared innocent of the murder of the king. A Parliament was therefore summoned, and proclamations made for the discovery of all that were suspected to be accessory to the crime. And because the Earl of Lenox, father to the late king, accused principally Bothwell, and made great instance that before the Parliament met he should be brought to a trial, this also was granted, and Lenox summoned to have ready his accusations and proofs against the twentieth day. But Lenox, hearing nothing in the meantime from the queen of England, and fearing, as he said, to come to a town full of his enemies, desired to have the time prolonged; but he delayed doing it till it was too late. His letter to the queen, bearing date the 11th of April, could not come to her hands till after the 12th, which was the day assigned for the trial; so it went on, and Bothwell was acquitted by a jury of his peers, Morton soliciting for him. And a few days after his acquittal, the Parliament being

¹ Camden, p. 116.

² Camden, vit. Eliz. p. 116.

convened, where were present, besides bishops and abbots, twenty-six earls and lords of the temporal state, and among those Morton, Lindsay, Ruthven, and Semple, who were afterwards the chief of the conspirators, no person made any reclamation; on the contrary, the last day of the Parliament there was a bond signed by several of the nobility, and among others by Morton, by which they engaged themselves to join with Bothwell against all that should slander him with the king's murder, and at the same time declared their opinion in favour of his marriage with the queen.

By these artifices¹ of the conspirators the queen was kept in ignorance of Bothwell's guilt, and made believe that all the reports made of his being an actor in the crime were only calumnies of his enemies. So the process of his divorce with his wife being passed in both courts, and the banns proclaimed, they were on the 15th of May married by the same Adam Bothwell, bishop of Orkney, who was afterwards one of the principal instruments of Murray, at the conferences of York and London, in prosecuting and defaming the queen. This was the most unfortunate step that this queen ever made in all her life, by which she disengaged all her true friends, and furnished to her enemies, who had contrived all this plot, the means to ruin her.

Murray, after concerting measures with them, to avoid suspicion of his having any hand in the conspiracy, obtained leave from the queen to travel abroad before it broke out; and to blind the queen and Bothwell the more, he left them trustees in appearance of all that belonged to him. But Murray was scarce passed over from England to France, when, behold, those very men who had concurred to Bothwell's acquittal of the murder, and consented by bonds under their hands to the marriage, take up arms, as if they had intended to apprehend Bothwell, but underhand advised him to be gone, for fear that if he had been taken he had discovered all the conspiracy, and that at the same time his flight might serve for a new argument to accuse the queen. So, letting Bothwell slip off, they carried the queen along with them, and after using the greatest indignities towards her, shut her up close prisoner in the castle of Lochleven, under the custody of Murray's mother, who had the impudence to pretend that she was lawful spouse to King James v., and her son Murray that king's lawful son. Thus far Camden.

The first step of the conspirators² against the queen at her imprisonment was to deny her the common justice allowed to

¹ Camden, p. 117.

² Queen Mary's letter to Queen Elizabeth, of May 17, 1568.

the greatest criminals of the lowest rank; for when she saw that, against the assurance they had given her, they were resolved to send her prisoner to Lochlevin, she earnestly entreated to be heard in her own defence in their council. This they absolutely refused, and hurried her away in the night-time in a beggarly habit to Lochlevin. But the reason of their refusing her this common justice is plain. They knew that if she had been permitted to appear in their council she could have reproached all of them that sat there to their faces,—the concurrence of some, and the connivance of all of them to the acquittal of Bothwell and his marriage with her, which now were made her greatest crimes.

The queen being thus made close prisoner, and no person whatsoever being suffered to see, speak, or write to her but her jailors and those of the faction, by this the government being unhinged, the conspirators remaining masters, in order to have a title to dispose of all at their pleasure, erected themselves into a secret or privy council; but being conscious to themselves that by laying violent hands on their sovereign they were guilty of the crime of treason in the highest degree, and by that had forfeited their lives and fortunes, it was of the last importance for them to fix guilt upon the queen at any rate, and have her thought worthy of deprivation, or even of death.

They had been obliged to go hastily to work, and not to let escape the opportunity of the queen's coming over to them and voluntarily putting herself into their hands, on their solemn promises of serving and honouring her according to her dignity. When once they had gotten her, it was of importance to make haste to secure her. All promises were forgot, and by this violence they had begun to treat her as the meanest criminal, even before they found out any ground of accusation; for, according to themselves, the famous box was not discovered till five days after they had made her close prisoner. This was crime upon crime, and put them to a sad pinch now what to do to render the queen guilty; for after the length they had gone, guilty she must be, else they were lost men, and would have been condemned by all mankind. Morton was a man of expedients. He produces a box with letters pretended to be the queen's, with her first husband, King Francis', cypher on it. That was an easy matter. By this time Morton and the rest were masters of the queen's palace and of all her closets, cabinets, and boxes; they might pick and choose. Morton said it was found on Dagleish, who was carrying it to Bothwell; but there is not one word of that in Dagleish's confession, even such as they extorted from him by torture;¹ and 'at the time of his

¹ Bishop Lesly's defence of Queen Mary, fol. 11.

execution he took it upon his death, as he should answer before God, that he never carried any such letters, nor that the queen was participant, or of counsel in the cause.' But the letters and sonnets in the box contained proofs that the queen had knowledge of Bothwell's criminal design against her husband, and these were written with the queen's own hand. So both Morton and Murray swore; but they had both sworn oaths of allegiance and fidelity to their sovereign, to maintain with their blood her honour, her royal dignity, and her life; and they made this new oath with a formed design to ruin and destroy all three. Which of the two shall we believe? The first was free and voluntary, the second was forced; for after the length they had gone, without that they swore the letters to be the queen's, they were lost men. And was there any impartial judge that ever declared they were the queen's hand? I say impartial, and that had no interest to have them believed to be hers. And were there not then persons alive that had counterfeited the queen's hand? It was known there were.

But it was enough for the rest of the conspirators that it resembled her hand; they were too deeply concerned to doubt of it. Declamations from the pulpit, ballads for the mob, telling and writing, far and near, the tragical contents with a wonder, and horror, and feigned regret, would supply the rest, till all the ends of the conspiracy were compassed, a demission extorted from the queen, her son crowned, and Murray regent; and then who durst say the contrary? To help it on, M. Knox and his associates served them marvellously by their invectives from the pulpit to inflame the mob against her, and by wrested texts of the Old Testament exhorted them to put the queen to death. Sir Nicolas Throgmorton, Queen Elizabeth's ambassador, tells her he was present at one of these preachings, and so scandalized that he complained publicly of it to these lords; but they were far from putting any stop to the declamations of men that served them to so good purpose towards the justification of their enterprise and of their imprisoning the queen.

Sir Nicolas Throgmorton¹ had been sent down by Queen Elizabeth, who, detesting their barbarous insolence (whom she often called traitors, rebels, ungrateful and cruel men²) against a princess, her sister and neighbour, sent him into Scotland to expostulate with them for their insolence, and to take some course how to restore the queen to her former liberty, and for the severe punishment of the murderers of the king. Camden gives an account of Sir Nicolas' negotiations from his own

¹ Camden, p. 118.

² 'Perfidos, rebelles, ingratos, & crudeles subinde appellabat.'—Camden, p. 117.

letters, whereof he gives the substance, which I need not repeat. I shall only take notice that the conspirators were divided among themselves what to do with the queen, and that some of them were for making her process, and depriving her both of her life and of her crown by a public execution; ‘and this,’ says Camden, ‘Knox and some other ministers of the word thundered out of the pulpit.’¹

Sir Nicolas argued very pertinently against these illegal and barbarous designs (I relate his own words, taken from one of his original letters to Queen Elizabeth, which I have seen):²—‘I said [to them] there was no ordinary magistrates, no competent judge or judges, no sufficient assembly nor tribunal, before whom their queen and sovereign should have her process made and her cause adjudged. For there was no ordinary justice, but they had their authority derived from the authority of the queen, and it was not to be thought she would give commission against herself; and to abuse the grete sele to make any commission, to borrow her name without her consent and warrant, to make any process, and abuse her title, was insufficient and hye treason.’

‘I was answered,’ says Sir Nicolas, ‘in extraordinary enormities and monstrous doings there have been and must be extraordinary proceedings. It was said, the states of the realne and people assembled might in the case be competent judges, whereof they had in their own countrie sundrie experiences in criminal maters committed by princes, and there was recyted unto me sundrie examples forthe of their own histories.’ This is the first time that examples are brought from the Scottish history of the subjects proceeding criminally against our kings. If any such had been in King James III.’s time they had not failed, as we observed on that occasion,³ to allege them, and their not doing it on such a pressing occasion, when all the world within and without the kingdom cried out against them, was a proof that there were not as yet any such examples in being. But now in Queen Mary’s time they had the precedent of the ‘Act of the Proposition of the Field of Striveling,’ and many other instances in Boece’s history, and it was no doubt to those that they refer in arguing with the ambassador. Meantime it was not in his power, nor in that of the French ambassador, with all the authority of their princes, to obtain from the faction leave to see or to speak with the queen.

The conspirators, by their keeping the queen so close a

¹ ‘Et hoc Knoxius & aliqui ministri intonarunt.’—*Camb. vit. Eliz.* p. 118.

² Sir Nic. Throgmorton’s letter of the 19th of July, 1567. *Cot. Libr. Cal. c.* 1, fol. 18.

³ *Supra*, p. 165.

prisoner, had the means to blacken her reputation everywhere at home and abroad without control. To that purpose served not only the violent declamations of Knox and his partisans, but ballads full of bitter invectives spread up and down the country to poison and alienate the people's affections from her. With the same view the faction wrote and spread into all countries where they had correspondence, particularly in England and France, the most infamous calumnies that their malice could invent, and all this with so much the greater impudence that they were sure not to be contradicted; by keeping the queen in so close confinement, without permitting her so much as to see or have any correspondence either within or without the kingdom, they put it out of her power to justify herself, or contradict whatsoever calumnies they published against her.

And this close confinement continuing near a whole year, and during all that time the calumnies spread abroad by her enemies against her having free course without being contradicted, it is no wonder that they left deep impressions against her reputation, which not only encouraged her enemies to affirm and spread them with greater assurance, but stumbled even some well-meaning people; for the Machiavelian maxim, ‘Calumniare stoltly, something will always stick,’¹ was never more fully verified than in this injured princess, especially during her close confinement.

It was from this source that all the doubts, contradictory accounts, and disputes, which continue to this very day about her innocence or guilt, did chiefly arise, according as people are or were differently affected towards her, her family, and the religion she professed; for after so deeply-rooted impressions to her prejudice by such a torrent of calumnies that had flowed with a full course and without any obstacle during the eleven months of her close confinement, the defences and justifications published afterwards, however full, came too late to extinguish all the impressions without leaving some in doubt of her innocence. So it is no wonder that, when after her escape from Lochlevin she came into England, she found Queen Elizabeth and many of her council prejudiced against her,—all mouths having been so long open against her, and her own, and those of all her friends, shut by the terror of Murray and his faction.

But, however, these bad impressions continued some time in France, not only among the French Protestants, who kept correspondence with Murray, Knox, and the faction in Scotland, but even among some Roman Catholics, out of an aversion to the house of Guise, and in England by reasons of state; for it

¹ ‘Calumniare fortiter semper aliquid adhæredit.’

being thought necessary, for the security of Queen Elizabeth's government, to keep Queen Mary in prison, the entertaining the suspicion of her guilt served for a pretence to it.

It was not so in Scotland, where the queen's character and whole conduct during all the course of her reign whilst at liberty, and all that had passed concerning the murder of the king and her marriage with Bothwell, as well as the character and behaviour of the conspirators, were best known; for notwithstanding all the declamations of Knox and his associates—notwithstanding the forged letters and sonnets of Morton's box, and all the other malicious arts employed to defame her—notwithstanding, also, all the violence and cruelty with which Murray made use of the royal authority which he had usurped to ruin all that declared for the queen,—all these and the other malicious calumnies of her enemies were so far from gaining credit, that as soon as the queen got out of her confinement, the generality of all the nobility and gentry all over the kingdom that were not of the conspirators declared openly for the queen; and by their bonds and associations, both in the south and in the north, engaged themselves one to another, and by their letters to foreign princes, to venture their lives and fortunes in her defence, and towards restoring her to the exercise of her royal authority.

There is in the Cotton library¹ a copy of a bond made at Glasgow the 5th of May 1568, to this purpose, signed by nine earls, nine bishops, eighteen temporal lords, twelve abbots and priors, and above fourscore great barons. There is extant an original letter,² signed by many earls, lords, and barons, addressed to the king of France about the same time. There are two other original letters to Queen Elizabeth, of the 28th of July³ and 24th of August,⁴ in the same Cotton library, signed by a number of the nobility, declaring their resolution to stand by their sovereign, and to hazard their lives and fortunes in her cause, entreating Queen Elizabeth herself either to restore her, or at least leave her at freedom to come to them. The same general disposition of Scotland in favour of the queen appears by a letter of the Lord Herries to Queen Elizabeth, at whose desire Queen Mary had sent that lord to Scotland to hinder the civil war and the shedding of blood, Queen Elizabeth giving hopes that she herself would restore Queen Mary. The letter is of the 19th of August 1568,⁵ and begins thus: ‘Madam, at my return to this countrie [Scotland] I fand the greatest part of this realme so inflamed against the Earls of

¹ *Caligula*, c. 1, fol. 62.

² In Col. Scot. Paris.

³ *Caligula*, c. 1, fol. 136.

⁴ *Ibid.* fol. 156.

⁵ Cot. Libr. Calig. B. ix. fol. 267.

Murray and Morton, with some others of their adherents, for their proud treason and contempt against our native sovereign, they had appointed an day to cause them repent their misdoeings and acknowledge their obedience, or at least therin to do thair power; and for that your G. had declared your mind to my simpleness, was to putt my mistress in her own countrie and authoritie without bloodshed,' etc.

By all these letters and bonds, made by so many of the greatest of the kingdom at the hazard of their lives and fortunes, it is easy to judge what account ought to be made of a bond called the second bond, printed by Sir James Dalrymple from an original in the College of Glasgow, to which Murray procured a number of subscriptions, to acknowledge his authority under the name of the infant prince, in his circuit courts, from the month of July till his Parliament in December 1567, for the most part extorted¹ by the terror of being treated as rebels, and this during the queen's close imprisonment.

But I find the indignity with which those good subjects used their sovereign hath more than once insensibly carried me out of my road. I must now return to Buchanan.

Whilst the queen was in prosperity and in possession of the throne, Buchanan continued to make his court by epigrams addressed to her Majesty, some of which still remain;² and among others, that of the 17th of December 1566, on occasion of the baptism of the prince her son, of which we shall have occasion again to speak more at large. The queen also, on her side, continued to heap new favours on Buchanan, whereof one of the latest was the principalship of the College of St. Leonards in St. Andrews; but how soon the queen was stripped of all, shut up in close prison, and deprived of all power of bestowing any favour, and that his patron Murray was coming to be at the head of affairs, Buchanan turned about with the tide, and not only became her enemy, but signalized himself against her. The first occasion that we find him declare against her is very remarkable, and no doubt served as much as anything to fix him in that party.

The General Assembly³ of the Kirk met at Edinburgh, the 25th of June 1567, ten days after the queen's imprisonment, a time of triumph for them; and M. George Buchanan, though a mere layman, was chosen moderator or president of this assembly, which, in their account, was the first free assembly

¹ *Vide* pp. 63, 59, 92, 98, nov. edit. A.D. 1715.

² Crawford's Memoirs of Scotland, A.D. 1706, pp. 57, 58.

³ *Vide* the Acts of the General Assemblies, belonging to Archibald Campbell, Esq.

they had held. For as long as the queen was on the throne, or indeed any form of government subsisted, it was still some check on them who pretended, in their ecclesiastical affairs, to depend upon no power upon earth ; and therefore, as King James VI.¹ says of them, they looked upon all kings and princes as enemies to the liberty of the Kirk. And now they had their will and full liberty, the government was unhinged ; for as to the lords that had conspired against the queen, and intruded themselves into the administration under the precarious title of lords of the secret or privy council, which they had assumed to themselves in the interim till they had completed the whole design of the conspiracy, by setting up a new form of government,—as to these lords, they depended more upon the assembly, by the influence that Knox and his party had over the zealots and the mob, than the assembly did on them, and accordingly they came and joined it.

By the queen's close imprisonment, she was, *de facto*, divested of all exercise of the regal power. This assembly, with Buchanan at their head, seem to have assumed it in the interval ; at least they acted as if it had been devolved upon them. It had never been heard of hitherto in Scotland, that any except the sovereign could send out their writs to all the nobility and gentry, etc. of the kingdom, requiring them to convene on a precise day and place, with certification of the highest punishment they could inflict against the refractory. On the contrary, this seditious course stood prohibited, under pain of high treason, by many Acts of Parliament of Scotland.

This is nevertheless what this assembly, with their president Buchanan, did not hesitate to do, by directing their writs (they called them missives) with chosen deputies, not barely to ministers, but *nominatim* to all earls, lords, barons, and gentlemen, of whatever degree, etc., requiring them (that is their term) to convene at Edinburgh against the 20th of July next, with certification that all those that refused to obey should be reputed hinderers of the godly purpose in hand, and unworthy to be esteemed of Christ's flock ; 'seeing,' add they, 'God has begun to throw down Satan under foot.' The meaning of this last expression was easily understood in that juncture.

The godly purpose in hand, pretended to be the end of this new kind of assembly, was to establish the Kirk on a surer foundation, to root out everywhere all remains of what they called idolatry, and to settle the ministers, stipends, etc. ; but in reality, as it appeared by the event, the chief work was that the queen might be either taken away or deposed, if she should

¹ 'Omnis reges & principes ecclesiae libertati esse inimicos [prædicabant].' — *Jac. R. vi. Basilic.* down to p. 148.

refuse to make a demission of the crown, and a new king was to be created, which is Buchanan's expression at the accession of our kings to the crown, however due to them by hereditary right. But the expression was exactly true, in the putting the crown on the head of the infant prince, who had no right to it as long as the queen his mother, from whom alone all his title was derived to it, was alive; but his coronation was only to serve for a vehicle to convey the royal authority to Murray and the rest of the conspirators, which was the scope they levelled at from the beginning.

But what a conspicuous figure M. George Buchanan makes here, to be all on a sudden transplanted from the mean station of a grammarian, a poet, or at best the principal of a college, to be at the head of an assembly that acted so sovereign a part; and the deposing the queen, and investing his patron Murray with her royal authority, being the consequence of the writs issued out from this assembly, it is not to be wondered at that M. George Buchanan, now changed into a new man, should take upon him, in his libel *De Jure Regni*, etc., to dictate to kings the rules by which they were to govern, under pain of being pursued by their subjects, obliged to answer before their tribunal, deposed, etc.; and that we shall find him henceforth employing all his eloquence to justify the deposition of his sovereign, and to support his patron in the possession and exercise of the royal authority.

The new assembly, convoked by the writs issued out from the aforesaid assembly in which Buchanan presided, met accordingly the 20th of July; and one of their first businesses was the deputing the Lord Lindsay to Lochlevin, where, by terror of death, he extorted from the queen a demission of the crown in favour of her son, and a commission of regency to Murray. The infant prince was crowned, and Murray, by concert, coming home very soon after, took possession of the royal authority, and thus all the ends of the conspiracy were obtained.

In the month of December following, a Parliament was holden by Murray, in which, among other acts, he and his party, who were entire masters in that assembly, not content to insert and approve the aforesaid acts of the queen's demission and commission of regency, etc., as if they had been voluntary acts, but fearing lest the queen might escape, and not doubting but in that case she would declare these acts extorted by force and null,—therefore, to secure as much as they were able their lives and fortunes, and to give a show or appearance of justice to their conspiracy and imprisoning of their sovereign, in order to appease the public clamour that was raised against them, both

within the kingdom and without it, they made an Act, entitled, ‘Anent the retention of our sovereign lord’s mother’s person,’ in imitation of, and copied after, the Act ‘Of the Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Striveling’ against the memory of King James III., of which we have elsewhere treated; and as the cause and proceeding in both these cases were much of the same nature, and both the Acts equally against all the natural as well as positive laws, so the essential terms of both Acts are much the same. Thus, as the authors of that against King James III. make the son condemn the father and his perverse council (so they call the loyal party that adhered to him), and declared and concluded that the slaughter committed in the field of Striveling, where the king and divers others of his barons happened to be slain, was all utterly in their default, etc., and themselves free, quit, and innocent of all; so in the Act against the queen, the conspirators make the son, an infant of a year old, find and declare, together with them, his mother guilty of the murder of his father, and that the imprisonment of her person, and all the violences done or that might be done afterwards to her, were in ‘her awin default,’ and themselves (the conspirators) ‘free, quit, and innocent of the same.’ And all the proof of the queen’s guilt that they allege in their Act is chiefly her marriage with Bothwell, whereof the principals of themselves were the promoters; and the letters, sonnets, etc., found in Morton’s box, though they had never as yet been verified to be the queen’s hand by any impartial judges, unless they themselves, whose lives and fortunes lay at stake (if they did not prove the queen’s guilt, and by consequence affirm these letters and papers to be the queen’s), could be esteemed impartial judges; not to speak of the open hatred and violence with which they were actually then tyrannizing over the afflicted princess, among other injustices¹ refusing to hear her, either in person or to suffer any advocate to plead for her, forcing the rest of the assembly to comply with them.

Soon after,² Murray put to death John Hepburn, Paris a Frenchman, Dagleish, and the other servants of Bothwell, who had been present at the king’s death; but they (which Murray little expected) at the gallows protested before God and the angels that they understood by Bothwell that Murray and Morton were the authors of killing the king, and cleared the queen from all suspicion. Queen Mary’s commissioners, in their memorial³ given in the 1st of December 1568, at the conference of Westminster, affirm that this declaration of those criminals at their death was manifest to ten thousand, that is,

¹ Letter of Queen Mary to Queen Elizabeth, 17th May 1568.

² Camden, p. 121.

³ Cot. Libr. Calig. c. 1, fol. 234.

to all the multitude present at their execution; and Bothwell himself, prisoner in Denmark, all his lifetime, and at his death, did, with many solemn oaths and religious protestations, affirm that the queen was not privy nor consenting to it; and Morton at his death acknowledged that Bothwell had told him that the deed [meaning the king's murder] must be done without the queen's knowledge.¹

In May following, the captive queen escaped out of prison, from Lochlevin, by the means of George Douglas, whose brother was her keeper, and got safe unto the castle of Hamilton, where her resignation was declared null, being extorted by fear; but the forces that resorted to her being defeated, she fled towards the borders, and, trusting to the assurances given her by Queen Elizabeth, against the advice of her friends, she passed over into England, where, instead of the assistance she had reason to expect, she soon found a new captivity. Queen Elizabeth, being persuaded by some of her ministers that her security and that of her government in a great measure depended upon detaining this afflicted princess, and in order to have a pretence for it, which might serve for an excuse or answer to the solicitations of other foreign princes in Queen Mary's behalf, Murray and his associates were called up to England, under colour of answering for their proceedings against their sovereign, but in reality, as it appeared by the event, to give them a fair occasion, which they wanted, to produce and render public the papers of Morton's box and the other accusations they had invented against their sovereign, by which means her reputation might be blackened among the English, among whom she was believed to have too many favourers of all ranks; and at the same time the Court of England might have a specious pretence neither to concur to her restoration, nor to leave her at liberty to depart the kingdom.

This politic design had its desired effect, for the Bishop of Ross and the other commissioners of Queen Mary, after making a solemn protestation for the independency of the imperial crown of Scotland, whilst Murray and his partners, who pretended to be the sole representatives of that kingdom, by their cowardly silence seemed to make a base surrender of its rights, in their reply demonstrated the illegality and inhumanity of the proceedings of these rebels against their sovereign, which was all that could in justice be required for their condemnation, and to obtain from the Court of England the support which Queen Mary had ground to expect towards her restoration. Instead of that, the new English commissioners, being

¹ Camden, *ibid.*

previously informed of the papers of the box, and other accusations brought against the queen, summoned Murray to produce them; which he, after assurance of protection for himself and his party, with a feigned reluctance not only exhibited, but, having designedly brought Buchanan along with him, employed his virulent pen to write in a fine Latin style, addressed to Queen Elizabeth and her council, that infamous libel known by the name of *Detection*, to render these forged papers more probable.

And Queen Mary, however earnestly she pressed to have the liberty to come in person, and in the presence of Queen Elizabeth herself and of the ambassadors that represented the foreign princes, speak for herself in an audience suitable to her dignity, offering to demonstrate the falsehood of their accusations, and prove that her adversaries were guilty of these very crimes which they laid to her charge, that was refused her, as it had been in Scotland on two solemn occasions by her own rebellious subjects, as we have observed,—first, when she was imprisoned in Lochlevin, and again, when they proceeded in Murray's Parliament to depose her,—on both which occasions she was sentenced by her own subjects to imprisonment and to lose her crown, without being heard in her defence, though she earnestly and instantly solicited to be heard. As to the detail of these conferences, I shall refer my reader to Queen Elizabeth's own historian, Camden, who, living about the time, not only perused the original pieces and other writings in the paper office in the Cotton library and elsewhere, but had the advantage that no modern writer can pretend to, to converse on the whole with those that were in the secret, and at the bottom of the affairs of these times; and he being universally known for a man of penetration, of equity, and candour, appears to me more to be depended on for the truth of facts than any of those who have hitherto or may hereafter write the history of Queen Mary. So I return to Buchanan.

Camden¹ informs us that his libel, entitled, *The Detection*, was of small credit with the greater part of the English commissioners, Buchanan being a man devoted to Murray's party, and won by money to write.

To this I shall add one instance, by which we may judge of the rest of that infamous libel, and of the credit that Buchanan deserves in his virulent declamations against his sovereign and benefactrix, both in this libel and in his history; and I think it may very well be doubted of whether he himself believed the

¹ ‘Buchanan libellus (eui) titulus *Detectio*—parum fidei apud majorem partem cognitorum invenit, ut hominis partiarii & fide promereali.’—*Camden, Vit. Eliz.* p. 144.

calumnies that he advanced against her, as it will appear by the following example.

Buchanan,¹ in his *Detection*, employs betwixt three and four pages, in the new edition in folio, in describing the queen's lewdness with Bothwell, and maltreating her husband from the birth of the prince, 19th June 1566, till his solemn baptism, December 17. And in a diary (to be found in² the Cotton library), drawn up for secretary Cecil's use by Buchanan himself, or some other of Murray's creatures, containing a summary of the *Detection*, in which, to render the crimes with which they accuse the queen more credible, the places, occasions, times, etc. are marked; and in particular July 20, at Alloway; August 13, at Megitland; September 24, October 8, November 5, December 3, and so on at different places, all named and set down till December 17, the day of the solemnity of the baptism, so that by that time the queen (according to the *Detection*) was in the eye of the public reputed a monster of all kind of wickedness; and particularly at this solemnity he brings in the queen sparing no expense, nay, employing her own hands to fit out Bothwell as a beau, whilst the king her husband had not decent clothes to put on or appear in public. All this Buchanan tells with the greatest airs of confidence two years after to Queen Elizabeth, her commissioners and counsellors, as things notorious, that he and all the public knew, and were witnesses to at the time.

Yet all this was false, and Buchanan knew it to be false; and that the queen at that very time of the solemn baptism of the prince was far from having led a scandalous life, or being reputed in the eye of the public a monster of wickedness, as the *Detection* says she was. It was just the reverse in Buchanan's own judgment, and in that of the public,—'The lustre of the queen's virtue was then so bright, that it attracted to her the hearts of all those whose breasts were influenced with virtue.' And he adds, that then and there she was happier than her happy ancestors; that is, she surpassed them not only in sense and beauty, but in virtue.

The ceremony was very solemn, and the assembly numerous, consisting not only of all the best and greatest of the Scottish nobility and gentry, but there were present the ambassadors of the king of France and of the queen of England, each of them with a numerous retinue of gentlemen of their nation; and it was amidst this assembly that M. George Buchanan, the most famous poet of the age, to grace the solemnity, presented an epigram to the queen and to the young prince, and puts the

¹ Buchanani Detectio, pp. 1-4, tom. i. edit. Freebairn, A.D. 1715.

² Caligula, B. ix. fol. 247.

address, as is usual with poets, in the mouths of the rural deities.

Thus he makes the Mermaids address the queen:¹ ‘ As the needle inforced by the touch of the magnesian stone veers its eager point to the northern pole, so whoever’s breast is influenced with virtue, whatever climate he inhabits, thee he points at. It is this hidden power that hath attracted us hither from the Indian shore, more forcibly than the iron is by the loadstone, that we may have the pleasure of admiring a-near the lustre of thy virtues, and with such small presents as our country affords, testify to thee our most humble respect and homage.’

‘The Sylvan Gods to the Queen.

‘ In virtue, sense, and beauty happier than thy happy ancestors ; but most happy in the fruit of thy marriage, whose

¹ ‘Pompæ Deorum rusticorum dona ferentium Jacobo vi.¹ & Mariæ matri ejus Scotorum regibus, in cena quæ regis baptisma est consecuta.

‘ Nereides Reginæ matri
 Vis dura ferri marmoris
 Magnesii contagio
 Imbuta vertit algidam
 Ad arcton acrem cuspidam.
 Cuicunque virtus imbuīt
 Potenti’ vi præcordia,
 Te spectat unam, cardini
 Cuicunque cœli subjacet :
 Arcana vis haec Indico
 Nos traxit huc a littore,
 Ut non trahat potentius
 Ferrum filex Heraclea.
 Virtutis ut proprius tuæ
 Claro fruamur lumine,
 Et patriis munusculis
 Testemur observantiam.

‘ Fauni Reginæ.
 Virtute, ingenio, Regina, & munere formæ
 Fælicibus fælicior majoribus,
 Conjugii fructu sed fælicissima, cuius
 Legati honorant exteri cunabula :
 Rustica quam² donis reverentur numina, sylvis
 Satyri relietis, Najadesque fontibus
 Faunos in melius properantis pignora sæcli
 Responsa ferre cœlitum Rex haec jubet :
 Omnis in hunc rerum consensu machina regem
 Non forte lectum, aut lege, sed fato datum ;
 Non aliter quam natura novere magistra,
 Monstrante nullo, apiculæ suum ducem.’

—Buchanan Epigram. lib. 3, p. 98, edit. Freebairn, A.D. 1715.

¹ It appears by this title of King James vi. and that of queen-mother, that this piece hath been revised by Buchanan after the queen’s imprisonment, and the coronation of the prince.

² Quem, edit. 1715.

birth foreign ambassadors congratulate; whom the rural deities compliment with presents; the satyrs forsaking their woods, the nymphs their fountains; the sylvan gods, commanded by their king, carry this heavenly message as a pledge of happier succeeding ages hastening to mankind. To create this king, the immense universe has combined,—nor chance, nor law, have any hand in it, fate hath decreed it. Just so the little bees untaught, through the pure instinct of nature, know their leader.' Thus Buchanan.

Now when Buchanan publicly presented this epigram to the queen on so solemn occasion, it was, no doubt, designed to be handed about among the Scotish and English nobility, and others present at the solemnity, as it is usual on such occasions; and by consequence Buchanan must have been not only persuaded himself that the queen was at that time esteemed a model of virtue, capable to attract all well-disposed hearts, etc., but that the English and Scotish nobility present were equally persuaded of the truth of what his epigram contained; otherwise to make so public an elogium of the queen's virtue had been to prostitute his reputation, and make himself pass for a sycophant, which surely he was not likely to do.

I ask now which of the two extremes of the contradiction are we to trust to? Buchanan in this epigram (on the 17th of December 1566), giving us the highest characters of the queen's virtue, and rendering such a public testimony to it in the presence of such an assembly, where the queen's character and behaviour was so well known; or the same Buchanan in his *Detection*, telling the queen of England and her council that at this very time Queen Mary was publicly known for a vicious monster, and expatiating before them on the subject with all the fluency of his virulent pen? For I speak here only of that time, to wit, of the time of the baptism of the prince, the 17th of December, what she was in the eye of the public, and in Buchanan's own at that time, for the papers found by Morton in his box contained nothing of these times.

The only proper solution for this difficulty and contradiction is to distinguish the times of the queen's prosperity and adversity. When Buchanan presented the epigram, with such high elogiums of the queen's virtue, her majesty was as yet on the throne, in the full exercise of her royal authority, mistress of favours and rewards. But when Buchanan presented the *Detection*, just two years afterwards, to Queen Elizabeth and her council or commissioners, Queen Mary had been deposed from her throne, deprived of all, a captive first in Scotland and then in England; the exercise of her royal authority transferred to Murray, and he become the distributor of all favours and

rewards; and with him no merit was equal to that of defaming Queen Mary, that being the only means to have her continued in captivity and himself in the exercise of her royal authority. Accordingly, Buchanan was recompensed for his service with the honourable and advantageous posts of director of the chancery¹ and keeper of the privy-seal.

I shall add no more, but that this may serve in a great measure with impartial people for a key to the rest of Buchanan's *Detection*, and his other declamations against Queen Mary, which, if she had continued on the throne, had not only never have been composed, but in all appearance the queen, on the contrary, might have had more incense presented to her from the same hand, since in that case Morton's box with the letters would never have been heard of. And if the queen had come to be, as without doubt in process of time she would have been, informed and persuaded of Bothwell's crime, both he and his partners in it would have suffered the punishment due to it.

But to return to Murray; though Queen Elizabeth was well enough contented, out of² an emulation ordinary to the sex, that some blot or reproach by these accusations of Murray was left, and remained upon her rival the queen of Scotland, yet she was too jealous of the prerogative of the royal dignity, and of the respect due to sovereign princes, to have it thought that she would countenance Murray and his party in their taking up arms, imprisoning their sovereign, and depriving her of her crown and dignity, for whatever cause or crime. And this Queen Elizabeth herself had let the Scotish conspirators know, upon the first news she received of their enterprise against their sovereign, by her ambassador Sir Nicolas Throgmorton, whom she had sent down in the month of June 1567; and in her letter to him of³ 27th July following, to be imparted to them, she argues powerfully for the sovereignty of princes, and against the illegality of the conspirators' proceedings: these are her words:

' You shall let them (the conspirators) know, that if they shall determine anything to the deprivation of the queen their sovereign lady of her royal estate, ye are well assured of our own determination. And we have some just and probable cause to think the like of other princes of Christendom; that we will make ourselves a plain party against them, to the revenge of their sovereign, for example to all posterity; and therein we doubt not but God will assist us, and confound them and their devices, considering they have no warrant nor authority of the law of God or man to be as superior judges or vindicators over

¹ Memoirs of Scotland by Crawford, printed A.D. 1706, Pref. p. 4.

² Cand. p. 145.

³ Cotton librar. Caligula, c. 1, fol. 26, 27, etc.

their prince and sovereign. Howsoever, they do gather or conceive matter of disorder against her ; and therein we appeal them to recur to their own consciences what warrant they have in Scripture to depose their prince ; but contrary, and that with express words of St. Paul, who to the Romans commanded them to obey *potestibus supereminentioribus gladium gestantibus*, although it is well known that the rulers in Rome were infidels ; or what law do they find written in any monarchy, when, how, and in what sort subjects shall take and arrest the person of their princes, commit and detain them in captivity, proceed against them by process and judgment ; as we are assured no such order is to be found in the whole civil law. And if they have no warrant by Scripture or civil law, and yet can find out for their purpose some examples, as we hear, by seditious ballads they put in print, they would pretend, we must justly account those examples to be unlawful, and acts of rebellion ; and so if the stories be well made the successes will prove them.' [And thus, after condemning their proceedings, and assuring them that she would concur towards the punishing Bothwell, and the preservation of the prince, she continues in these words:] 'But herein we dissent from them, that we think it not lawful nor tolerable for them, being by God's ordinance subjects, to call her, who also by God's ordinance is their superior and prince, to answer to their accusations by way of force ; for we do not think it consonant in nature that the head should be subject to the foot.' Thus Queen Elizabeth, when Queen Mary was imprisoned by her subjects in Scotland.

And though reasons of state and the persuasions of some of her chief counsellors engaged her, from the moment that Queen Mary was under her own power, to change measures as to that distressed princess, and make use of the accusations brought by her rebellious subjects against her for a handle to continue her captive, yet Murray and his party knew very well that Queen Elizabeth's sentiments of the respect due to sovereigns, and of the unlawfulness of taking arms against them, and pretending to depose them, for whatever reason, were still the same, it being a common cause of all sovereigns ; so whatever face she in the present juncture put upon their fact outwardly, they knew very well¹ she hated and detested them and all their doings in her heart.

There was therefore no other means left to Murray and his adherents to clear their cause from this odium, but to endeavour to separate the cause of the kings of Scotland from that of other kings, and to show that the kings of Scotland were answerable

¹ 'Elizabetha Scotorum insolentiam in abdicanda Regina ex animo, ut videbatur, aversata.'—*Camden*, p. 145.

to their subjects, and liable to be punished or deposed in case of maladministration, however it might be as to other kings.

It was, then, upon this occasion and in this juncture that Buchanan, either by Murray's order or of his own motion, as well to support their common cause against the queen as being otherwise prepossessed with the principles of a power in subjects to arraign and depose their kings, wrote his seditious dialogue, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, to endeavour to show that the kings of Scotland were accountable to their subjects for their actions and administration; and by consequence, that Queen Mary being, as he falsely supposed, guilty of crimes and mal-administration, had been justly deprived of her royal authority by her subjects, to whom, according to the principles supposed in this libel, it belonged both to judge and punish their kings when they found them guilty, and to dispose of the crown to the next heir. That Buchanan's dialogue, *De Jure Regni*, was penned upon this occasion and at this time, that is, towards the end of the conferences, or very soon after them, both the dialogue itself insinuates and original letters still remaining make it evident. Among others, a letter from M. John Betoun,¹ one of Queen Mary's agents then at London, of the 11th of March 1569. Another² original letter of Mr. Thomas Maitland, brother to Lethington, written to Queen Mary, December 1, 1570, in which he protests to her Majesty, that his being brought interlocutor into that dialogue to say whatever Buchanan thought proper for his purpose, was wholly Buchanan's own invention, and that he, Thomas Maitland, had not the least hand in it. And that it was written about A.D. 1569.³ Buchanan himself informs us, where he tells us that it was about 260 years after the coronation of King Robert I., which happened A.D. 1306.

However, copies of this dialogue were then handed about, to lessen the odium of Murray and his accomplices' proceedings, and to stop the public clamour and indignation upon Queen Mary's forced abdication; but it seems the dialogue after having served that turn was suppressed for a time by the author himself, and not printed, that I could meet with, till A.D. 1579. The reason why the printing of it was thus ten or eleven years delayed is not hard to be guessed at. The specious reasons it contains, and the air of demonstration with which the politic reasonings and facts whereupon it depends are advanced, sufficed to make it go down with those in England or Scotland who had interest that the afflicted queen should be oppressed, and considered it only as far as it concerned her personally, without weighing the consequences of it to all crowned heads, and the

¹ Memoirs of Scotland, in Col. Scot. Paris. tom. iv.

² Ibid.

³ De Jure Regn. p. 26, edit. Freebairn.

public tranquillity of kingdoms. But it was not yet in a condition to bear the test of the public, and wanted its chief and necessary supports to make it go down in foreign countries, and with impartial men at home.

The author, to prove the pretended right of the Scots to depose their kings, makes indeed use of politic reasonings, drawn from republican schemes, with which his knowledge of the ancient Greek and Latin histories furnished him, as well as the common doctrines of the leading ministers of the Geneva plan of Reformation. He endeavours also to pervert the texts of Scripture, so express for the duty of subjects to their sovereigns, for all which he hath been chastised by three of his learned countrymen,¹ and more succinctly by Sir George Mackenzie ; but the chief bottom upon which his dialogue is built are the examples and precedents of Scotish kings called to account by their subjects for their maladministration, and accordingly punished by them with deposition, imprisonment, or even with death ; and for this the history of the Scots is appealed to, in which Buchanan tells us that he could count above² twelve of these kings, that is, a third part of the first forty kings, besides others afterwards, who, for their crimes and wickedness, had been either condemned to perpetual prison, or, by a voluntary exile, or laying hands on themselves, had escaped the punishment due to their crimes. And elsewhere³ he tells us, that of these kings some had been condemned to perpetual prison, others to banishment, and others had been punished even with death.

SEC. III.—*Of Buchanan's History of the Scots.*

The only history of the Scots in vogue, when the dialogue was written, was that of H. Boece, in which, indeed, both the principles of this doctrine are supposed and supported, as we have seen before, by many instances taken from Veremund and such other forged pieces. Now, though Boece's history was at that time generally received, especially among those who had little or no knowledge of the state of Britain in ancient times, or who had been at no pains to examine the grounds of that history, yet Boece's whole narration being all over stuffed with false or fabulous stories, as it hath been already shown,⁴

¹ Nin. Winzet, Adam Blawod, William Barclay.

² 'Possem enumerare duodecim, aut etiam amplius reges (Scotiæ) qui ob scelera & flagitia, aut in perpetuos carceres sunt damnati, aut exilio, vel morte voluntaria justas scelerum penas fugerunt.'—Buch. *De Jure Regn.* p. 32, edit. Freebairn.

³ '—quosdam [Regum Scotiæ] perpetuis carceribus damnatos, alios partim exilio, partim morte multatos.'—*Ibid.* p. 26.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 148.

entirely contrary to all true history,—this was capable to decry so absolutely all its authority, in the judgment of all people conversant in ancient learning, whether strangers or natives, that it became quite useless towards supporting Buchanan's schemes of monarchy with all the impartial, learned, and polished part of mankind. There was therefore a necessity of new moulding the history of the Scots, to render it proper for Buchanan's purpose ; and he himself, as well prompted by men of his principles as fitted by his elegant Latin style, was prevailed on to set about it. He began to write it in or about the year 1570, and finished it about the year 1579 ; by which it appears that the printing the dialogue, *De Jure Regni*, already finished and communicated to the English ministry and others in the year 1569, was delayed till the year 1579 ; that the Scotish history was well near finished to support the dialogue.

A further proof that one of the chief motives of Buchanan in writing the history of Scotland was to establish popular power on the ruin of monarchical authority is, that in writing this history he had it in his option either to follow John Fordun and our ancient monastery books, which he in his own judgment looked upon, as we shall observe, as the surest monuments we had of history, or to follow Hector Boece's history, of which he himself made in reality little or no account, but only as it served his design against monarchy. Fordun and our ancient monastery books or records contained all we had remaining of ancient history, and certainly could have furnished Buchanan with much greater helps to it, before the general disaster that came upon our MSS. histories and records, about the time of the Reformation, by the burning and destroying churches and monasteries, than can be now expected ; and it is evident enough, by the critical dissertations contained in Buchanan's first three books, that his own light and knowledge (if his prejudices had not biassed him) would have led him to have taken Fordun and the ancient monuments of the Roman and British history for his guides, especially in the times preceding Fergus the son of Erch ; and by consequence, to have been as sparing in the history of the first forty kings as Fordun and the rest of our chronicles had been, who after all their searches do testify that they could find no full account of these kings.

But this method would have done no service to the cause in which Buchanan was embarked, for there were none of these instances of the power of the Scots to call their kings to account to be met with in Fordun, or any Scotish writer before King James III.'s reign, or even before Boece, who alone

contained such materials as were proper for his design; so Buchanan's own judgment and knowledge of antiquity being overruled by his passions, he resolved to follow Boece in his history of the forty kings, as being the only Scotish writer who could furnish him with instances towards supporting his new schemes of goverment,—the chief intent of Buchanan's undertaking being, as we said, to furnish proofs to support the principles he supposed in his libel *De Jure Regni*, as our learned countryman Gordon of Straloch hath in few words well expressed Buchanan's whole design:¹ “Qui centonem Buchanani De Jure Regni et historiam ejus exactè consideraverit, inveniet tractatum De Jure Regni Thesin propositam; historiam sic detortam ut Thesi firmamentum habeatur.”

We have already shown at length the forgery of the vouchers on whose authority Boece hath given us the lives and actions of the first forty kings; and by the same reasons, all that Buchanan hath written of them, being built on the same foundation, is overturned beforehand. But though both these writers have delivered much the same accounts of a pretended ancient custom and right in the Scots to call their kings to account, and punish them for their bad conduct, yet there appears a great difference betwixt the two as to the views, intentions, and sincerity with which they wrote, as well as to their ability and skill in ancient history and critical learning.

We have already observed, that the facility with which Boece received and followed all he found in his Veremund and other forged authors, on whose authority he built his history of the first forty kings, shows indeed a prejudice and bias in him in favour of the power of the nobles and states to limit the royal authority; and we have shown the different occasions by which this notion got footing and ripened in Scotland, especially after the death of King James III. It was the interest of all those that had a hand in the rebellion against that prince, or in the famous Act made to justify it, to propagate the notion; so no wonder that Boece was tainted with it, finding it so conformable to the taste of the times in which he lived, and to the practice of the most ancient times, according to his Veremund and other forged vouchers; to which his simplicity, credulity, and want of critical learning made him give credit, and look upon them as genuine copies of monuments of antiquity. But besides that, Boece was never embarked himself in any party against the government, or right of the monarch then in possession, and so had no private interest to support against monarchy. It does not appear that in writing his history he had any design against the right of the kings, but that his chief in-

¹ Bishop Nicolson's Scot. Hist. Librar. p. 119.

tention was to exalt the glory of his country, by ascribing to it so many heroic achievements, in ages when other northern nations made no great figure, or lay in obscurity. And he¹ tells us also himself, that one of his motives was to encourage our kings to virtue by the examples of good princes, and deter them from vice by the punishment of wicked ones.

But as for Buchanan, the case was very different. He had heartily espoused the party of rebels usurping the royal authority, under the name of an infant, against their sovereign; he had been one of the chief instruments within his sphere, by his virulent pen, to make usurpation successful and lasting; and that success depending very much on strengthening the principles of the deposing power, it was highly his interest, as well as inclination, to exert all his eloquence on that undertaking. On the other hand, he was certainly one of the most learned critics of his time, and a severe one too, when it was to his purpose; so that Buchanan followed Boece's history of the forty kings, not with a blind credulity, looking on it as well grounded, as Boece himself had followed his Veremund, but without believing himself the truth of the history of these forty kings, which he copied from Boece, or rather being persuaded it was all false and groundless; yet he made it his business to make it be believed by posterity, and all this with a premeditated design to render our kings accountable and liable to be punished by their subjects, as well as to justify the proceedings against Queen Mary in particular. This will, no doubt, appear a very heavy charge against so famed a writer, so much the more that it falls chiefly upon his probity and morality, and therefore requires not to be superficially treated, nor advanced without substantial proofs. In order to make it good, I shall endeavour to show—1st. That Buchanan had no other ground or authority for all he hath set down in his fourth book (over and above what Fordun contains) of the names, lives, and reigns of the first forty kings, but Boece's history. 2d. That Buchanan was persuaded that all that Boece wrote of the names, lives, and reigns of these forty kings (over and above what is in Fordun) was fabulous, and without ground or authority. 3d. That notwithstanding Buchanan himself did not believe the accounts that Boece gave of these kings, yet he does all that lies in his power to render them credible to posterity, and wrote his history with a design to impose them as true. 4th. That his chief intention in all this was to support the maxims of government he had settled in his dialogue, *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, or a power in the Scots to depose and punish their sovereigns.

¹ Boet. Præf.

SEC. IV.—(1) *That Buchanan had no other ground nor authority for all he hath set down in his Fourth Book (over and above what Fordun contains) of the Names, Lives, and Reigns of the first Forty Kings, but Boece's History.*

To be convinced of this, there needs no more but to compare together the accounts that these two historians give of these forty kings, and it will be found that Buchanan's account is a mere abridgment of that of Boece, in which Buchanan hath only omitted the fabulous stories, to give it, as we shall see, more credit. 2d. The same names of kings, the same genealogy, the years of their reigns and death, the same usage they met with from their nobles or states, contained in Buchanan's history, are to be found exactly in that of Boece, and in no other ancient history or record; nor is there one passage of all these forty kings' reigns in Buchanan which is not in Boece, excepting a few of no consequence from Roman writers. 3d. Though Buchanan in the fifth and following books of his history, from King Fergus II. downwards, is careful to quote our ancient monastery books or histories, such as Fordun, the book of Paslay, Winton, etc., yet he never mentions one Scotish historian to authorize anything of what he writes of the first forty kings in his fourth book. The reason is obvious, because he found nowhere but in Boece all that he relates of them, and nowhere but in him what he sets down of the deposing power.

SEC. V.—(2) *That Buchanan was persuaded that all that Boece had written of these first Forty Kings (over and above what is in Fordun) was fabulous, without any probable ground, and deserved no credit.*

That Buchanan was persuaded that all that Boece wrote of the genealogy, names, lives, actions, and reigns of these first kings was groundless and fabulous, is clear from the principles laid down by Buchanan himself in his second book of the ignorance in which the inhabitants of Britain were in ancient times of all past transactions; for no knowledge of past transactions could be preserved but either by written accounts and monuments of history, or by traditions or relations of the bards or seanachies. Now, as to written records or historical accounts of ancient transactions in Britain, Buchanan¹ first

¹ ‘In ea parte Britanniae quam Cæsar attigit, nulla prorsus vetustarum rerum erat memoria. Apud interiores vero, qui longe incultius agebant, longè minus: adeo ut cum illos de gentis origine, & veterissimis Insulæ cultoribus rogaret, nihil certe comperisse scribat.’—Buchan. *Hist.* lib. 2, fol. 12, novæ edit. Freebairn, p. 22.

supposes, with reason, that the northern and more inland inhabitants of Britain were more barbarous and ignorant of what passed before their time, than those upon the southern coast, where Julius Cæsar made his descent and inquiry, and yet even among those last Cæsar could find no accounts of past transactions; and he met with so great ignorance, that they believed the inland inhabitants¹ were originally of the island itself, and not come from elsewhere. And about one hundred years after Julius Cæsar, when the Romans had made the round of Britain, and discovered all the inmost recesses of it under Agricola, Tacitus,² who had his accounts from Agricola and those that accompanied him in that expedition, tells us he could find no certain account of the natives that he could commit to writing for the information of posterity; and this was about four hundred years after the time that Boece, and from him Buchanan, pretends to give us a distinct history of the reigns and actions of our ancient kings.

Buchanan³ proves the want of all ancient records of history in Britain from Gildas, the eldest British writer, who lived in the sixth age, and could tell us nothing of their origin or ancient civil history; and acknowledges that the little he hath of the religious part of their history was not from any British monuments or records, which, says Gildas,⁴ in case there ever were any, were quite lost. And this assertion of Gildas, which Buchanan brings to prove the want of historical records among the Britains, includes all the reigns of the first forty Scotish kings, since Gildas lived about one hundred years after the time that Boece and Buchanan place the overthrow of the Scotish monarchy in Britain, under Eugenius the First, who was according to them the last of these ancient forty kings, and predecessor to Fergus II., whom they make the restorer of the monarchy.

And by consequence Buchanan, by the inferences he draws from the expressions of Julius Cæsar, Tacitus, and of Gildas, having proved that even in the south of Britain the ignorance of past transactions and of all ancient records was so great in the fifth age, and supposing it must have been yet greater in the northern parts, Buchanan in course could believe nothing

¹ ‘Britanniæ pars interior ab iis incolitur quos natos in Insula ipsi memoriae proditum dicunt.’—*Cæsar, De Bello Gall.* lib. 5.

² ‘Post Cæsarem Corn. Tacitus non minore fide, quam diligentia scriptor, jam perlustrata Romanis classibus Britannia, intimisque latebris ejus excussis, ne ipse quidquam certi, quod posteritati proderet; invenit.’—*Buchan. ubi supra.*

³ ‘Gildas quoque, qui supra quadringentos annos post Tacitum vixit, se non e monumentis, quæ nulla erant, sed ex transmarina relatione, quæ scribit, tradere affirmat.’—*Buchan. ibid.*

⁴ *Histor. Gilda, c. 2, p. 2, edit. Tho. Gale.*

certain of what Boece relates of the reigns of the first forty kings, or any particulars of what passed in the north of Britain before the fifth age, except what could be drawn from the Roman or other foreign writers. I added here designedly, ‘by the inferences Buchanan draws from those passages,’ because I think he strains them beyond what they will bear in the original writers; but it suffices that he understood by these passages that as far down as the fifth or sixth age there was no credible accounts remaining of past transactions in the north of Britain, to convince us that Buchanan believed nothing of what he wrote after Boece in his history of the first forty kings.

This is not all: Buchanan in the same place, consequently to the ignorance in which he supposes, with reason, that the inhabitants of Britain were in those ages of all past transactions in the island, concludes by telling us that¹ they who pretend to ancient annals or records of things past of old in Britain, must first give us account who transmitted down these annals or histories to us; where they have been so long preserved and concealed, so as no mention should have been of them till of late; how they were conveyed down uncorrupted to us after so many ages. Would not one think that Buchanan had here in view Boece’s Veremund and other vouchers? at least, without naming them, he could not more plainly describe them. Besides that, though Veremund and the rest had been genuine histories, the question still recurs, What means they had to be informed of the particulars of the lives and reigns of these forty kings, the latest of them about seven hundred years before Veremund, and the earliest about thirteen hundred before he is supposed to have written?

But² lest recourse might be had to the bards or seanachies as the preservers of the memory of past transactions, Buchanan is careful to take away also that desperate refuge, and tells us plainly that it were ridiculous to expect any certainty of history from them; and for a proof of it, he gives us this description of them: that the bards were altogether ignorant of letters, and left no records of ancient transactions behind them; that the seanachies were maintained in every clan, on purpose to chant out by heart rhymes composed on the praises of their patrons, having no learning at all; and their subsistence depending on their flattering great men, no credit could be given to them.

¹ ‘Igitur qui de veteribus annalibus Britannorum originem afferre se asseverant, reddenda, opinor, illis erit ratio, Quis primus ista tradiderit; ubi tandem latuerint, quomodo ad nos tot post saecula incorrupta pervenerint.’—*Buchan. ubi supra*, novæ edit. p. 22.

² ‘Quod autem ad Bardos & Seneciones veteris memoriæ custodes, quidam configunt, prorsus perridiculè faciunt,’ etc.—*Buchan. ibid.* novæ edit. p. 22.

In fine, Buchanan concludes his observations upon the ignorance the Britains of old were in of the knowledge of ancient history in these words : ‘ In¹ so great a silence of ancient writers concerning matters of antiquity, when men were often ignorant of the truth of what passed in their own times, there being nothing assured and sincere, I think it more modest,’ says Buchanan, ‘ not to be ashamed to be silent, than by devising falsehoods to show one’s impudence, and slight the better judgment of other men.’ These were Buchanan’s sincere sentiments of ours and the rest of the British high antiquities, when, as yet free from, or laying aside, the violent spirit of faction and party wherewith he was animated in writing his history, he considered more calmly what he met with in the ancient Roman and British writers of the ignorance in which the Britains, even of the south, and more yet those of the north, were of all past transactions in ancient times, and, in particular, of those of the seven centuries from Fergus I. till Fergus II. How much more honourable had it been to his own reputation, and how happy for his country, if he had continued close to these principles, with which his more than ordinary erudition had furnished him !

As to the time when he wrote the first preliminary books of his history, whence the above-quoted passages are taken, the remark that M. Ruddiman makes in his learned observations on Buchanan’s history, upon a passage of the first book, where Buchanan corrects what he had advanced in his fourth book concerning the ancient monument commonly called ‘ Jules-Hoff’—that remark shows very well that the two or three first books were either written or at least revised, and augmented with new observations by the author, after the fourth book was composed ; but that these first books were composed, as to the substance of them, before the history, and only revised and augmented by Buchanan with new observations after he had written his history, appears to me much more probable for the reasons following.

1st. It seems much more natural that a man of Buchanan’s great reading would premise to the history which he intended to give of his country some such discussions on the country itself, the first inhabitants, etc., as are contained in the two first books, than bluntly to begin the history, as the fourth book doth, without any preliminary. 2d. There appears nowhere, that I could observe, in these first three books, anything of that spirit of party with which Buchanan was so possessed when he wrote his history, and in which he continued to the end of it, that it discovers itself almost in every page. 3d. It appears by

¹ Buchan. *ubi supra*, novæ edit. p. 23.

Buchanan's¹ letters, written about the time or after he had finished his history, and by the same learned author's² observations on them in Buchanan's life, that he was then so oppressed with the weight of age and infirmities that he had given over all studies that required any great application; and so I think it noways likely that he could, in those circumstances, have composed the first two books, which contain such a variety of observations that required a more than ordinary application, a ready memory, and presence of mind, of which Buchanan at that age, and under those infirmities, is not to be supposed capable; and that all he could do in that situation of body and mind was to revise what he had composed long before, and augment it with such new observations as he had afterwards made. In fine, the introduction, or beginning of the first book, appears visibly to be the words³ of a writer that had not already written the history of his country, but was only resolved to set about it.

So, upon the whole, I am much more inclined to look upon the first two books of Buchanan's history as composed by him, as to the substance, whilst he was yet unprejudiced, and before he was embarked in any party or faction, and whilst he had nothing in view but the truth of history, and was sincerely inquiring into the true state of the ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain, by the helps which his erudition and lecture of the ancient Greek and Roman writers furnished him, as well as the knowledge he had of the Gaelic and other ancient languages; and that he afterwards reduced these collections into the order in which we have them, with his additional observations, to serve for an introduction to his history.

But be that as it will, and whatever time he wrote those first books, it is very clear, by the passages that I have set down from them, that Buchanan was persuaded that there was no credible account of the history of the northern parts of Britain during the seven centuries of the reigns of the forty kings; and that the history that Boece had given of them was not only without any credible voucher, but fabulous, and contradicted by the more ancient historians of the Scots.

For it is a new proof that Buchanan, at the bottom, put no trust in Boece's history nor vouchers, and only followed him because he found him fit for his present purpose, that Buchanan was perfectly well acquainted with Fordun's chronicle

¹ 'Ego vero literis jam valedixi.'—*Epist.* 37, p. 32, novæ edit.

² 'Senio & morbis fractus.'—*Vit. Buchan.* novæ edit. p. 11.

³ 'Cum res gestas majorum nostrorum a fabularum vanitate liberare, & ab obliuione injurya vindicare statuisse, non ab re mihi facturus videbar, si a primordio,' etc.—*Buchan. Hist.* lib. 1, novæ edit. p. 1.

and our other monastery books, and valued them so much beyond Boece, that, in fixing the year of Fergus II.'s re-establishment, where properly Fordun's history of the reigns of our kings begins, he quite abandons Boece's chronology, who had postponed King Fergus II.'s restoration until A.D. 422 (that he might give that king time to go to the siege of Rome with Alaric, A.D. 409), and follows that of Fordun, who places this restoration A.D. 403. And Buchanan continues to follow Fordun's chronology in the succeeding reigns. This shows the little account he made of Boece and his famed vouchers; and that, if he had hitherto followed him, it was because he had no other guide in the reigns of the forty kings so fitted to his designs, for Fordun had passed over those reigns, and given only a slight account of one or two of them for want of vouchers.

Besides, that Buchanan in reality was so much persuaded that Fordun's authority in our history was preferable to that of Boece, that in the reigns of those among our kings, after Fergus II., whom Boece, from his forged vouchers, had set down as instances of the power that their subjects exercised over them, Buchanan, for the most part, sets down Fordun's account of these kings, though quite contradictory to that of Boece; though, at the same time, not to lose entirely such useful supports of his principles as those later instances of Boece furnish, he fails not to set down also Boece's accounts of these kings, and then leaves the whole in doubt and to the choice of his reader, knowing very well that men of his own principles, whom he had chiefly in view, would not fail to prefer that account of the story that confirmed them; but to be sure a man of Buchanan's principles had never left in doubt instances so proper to support them if he had not had a great esteem of Fordun's authority, and a very small value, if any at all, for that of Boece.

All this shows how well Buchanan was acquainted with Fordun's chronicles, and, by consequence, with the old genealogy of our kings, so often mentioned by Fordun and by all our monastery books. And the preference he gives all along to those over Boece's accounts, makes it no less certain that he valued incomparably more the series of that genealogy inserted in their chronicles, and looked upon it as the only authentic; so much the more that the names were conformable to the old Scotish or Gaelic idiom, whereof Buchanan, born in those parts, was a good judge; and so he must have looked upon the new genealogy in Boece's history, as well as the very names of the most of his first forty kings, as a new invention, and could not but evidently see that these names were forged upon false readings

of the ancient genealogy in Fordun and the other MSS. histories ; and, by consequence, Buchanan must have been in reality convinced in his judgment that Boece's whole history of the forty kings, having those forged names of kings for its foundation, was an invention of later times, posterior to Fordun, and therefore absolutely false and fabulous.

SEC. VI.—(3) *That notwithstanding Buchanan himself did not believe the accounts that Boece gave of the first Forty Kings (as we have seen), yet he did all that lay in his power to render them credible, and wrote his own History with that design.*

I. To put this in a clear light, let it be observed that all that is contained in the first six books of Boece's history concerning the forty kings may be naturally reduced to these three heads—1st. The number, names, and genealogy of these kings, with such passages of their lives and reigns as serve to exalt the honour of the Scots, and at the same time are not manifestly fabulous, or do not clash directly with the certain accounts we have from authentic history of the ancient state of the north of Britain. 2d. These particulars of Boece's history of the forty kings which are either visibly fabulous or evidently contradict true ancient history, in the judgment of all that are skilled in it; as also Boece's often quoting Veremund, and other pretended ancient writers peculiar to himself, and his relying on them for his guarantees. 3d. The many instances that Boece gives of the Scots exercising a power over their kings to call them personally to account, and punish them for maladministration. This supposed, we may easily discover Buchanan's motives in new moulding the Scottish history ; why he pursued Boece's plan of it, and followed him as his guide, preferably to Fordun and our monastery books ; and what method he was to follow to render the instances of the deposing power contained in Boece more credible to posterity.

II. There is no doubt but of these three heads, to which all Boece's history may be reduced, the third head, containing the many instances of the subjects curbing their sovereigns, was what chiefly pleased Buchanan, and those that set him at work ; that being the great support of all their politics in those days, to justify their having imprisoned their lawful sovereign, and forced her to renounce her crown to an infant, or rather to her greatest enemies under the child's name. Now, neither Fordun nor any one history preceding that of Boece furnishes so much as one instance of that power exercised by the Scots over their kings. Therefore the history of Boece, and that alone, was proper

for their purpose, and for carrying on the work of the times. But then the second head, or fabulous part of Boece's history, rendered all those instances of popular power, and indeed all the history of Boece's forty kings in general, absolutely incredible to all men versed in the ancient history of Britain; and so the whole became useless to their purpose, unless the particulars contained under that second head were retrenched. Now this could not be done but by new moulding Boece's history, and laying entirely aside all that is contained under this second head, and making up a compounded context of the first and third, the particulars contained under the first head being absolutely necessary for a vehicle to the third.

III. No man alive, as we have already observed, was fitter every way for executing this design than Buchanan: his erudition and skill in antiquity and critical learning, more than ordinary for that age, enabled him to discern and retrench what would visibly shock the learned, that is, all contained under the second head; his reputation in the learned world, and the air of assurance with which he writes, were proper to impose on the generality of the readers; and his excellent Latin style, formed on that of the purest Roman authors, enabled him to put the first and third heads, connected into a continued series of history, in the most taking dress, to set it off among the more polite readers. In fine, his republican principles of government, his prejudices against monarchy in general, and against his sovereign Queen Mary in particular, his union and joint interest with all the enemies of that princess, made him zealous in the cause.

IV. And now to come into the detail of the execution of the work laid upon him of writing our history in this new dress, in order to procure credit to all the instances of the deposing power mentioned in that of Boece, we shall find he hath left nothing untried to acquit himself of that charge, and taken all the most proper means to impose on posterity Boece's history reformed, and put it in the best dress, though he did not believe it himself. In order to this, he hath given us the same number of forty kings, though Fordun, whom he trusted more, had called them forty-five; the same genealogy as in Boece, though he knew it to be false and fictitious, as being contrary to that given by Fordun and by all writers and in all ages where it had been mentioned, and that of Boece never heard of before; the same names of kings, though he knew that most of them were forged of late on false readings of corrupted and new copies of the genuine old genealogy. He added also from Boece the years of their reigns, with such particulars of their lives and actions as were proper to make up a continued history,

and serve for a bottom to his instances of the deposing power. 2d. To make his new performance more plausible and acceptable to his own countrymen, and no doubt to give the country reputation among strangers, he hath omitted nothing credible in Boece that tended to show the antiquity of the monarchy, and appears very zealous in that (especially against Humphry Lhuyd, who had endeavoured to discredit Boece, which would have undermined all Buchanan's new fabric). He hath, moreover, taken from Boece such plausible accounts of the brave actions of the Scots in peace and war, under their first kings, as could not be proved fabulous or directly contrary to authentic history.

V. 3d. Though he hath nothing material in all his history of the forty kings but what is taken from Boece, and from him alone, yet, knowing that the learned began already to look on Boece as a fabulous writer, Buchanan, that he might not discredit his own performance, which he knew would happen if it had been thought to be built on the authority of Boece or his vouchers, takes particular care never once to name Boece or his Veremund, Campbell, etc., in all his fourth book, where he gives the history of the forty kings; but, on the contrary, to gain credit to his own work, and impose the better on his vulgar readers, he hath written that history with the air and assurance of a man that had good authority from ancient records of history distinct from Boece, but without ever telling us where they are to be found, or even so much as naming one of them, which he failed not to do on other occasions, when he finds, in the continuation of his history, Fordun or other writers distinct from Boece to vouch what he advances.

VI. 4th. To remove all that might render the credit of his history dubious, Buchanan hath carefully retrenched in his own history all those particulars of the second head of that of Boece which plainly contradicted ancient history, or which he foresaw would be looked upon as visibly fabulous, though they be asserted by Boece with an equal assurance, as taken from his Veremund and other vouchers, as the other facts which Buchanan retains. Such are the wives of the Picts interceding between them and the Scots, like the Sabinæ in the Roman history; Mainus, like Numa, establishing the sacred rites among the Scots, according to the Egyptian form; King Dornadilla's causing tables of laws to be written, etc. But all that fine policy, borrowed visibly from Titus Livius, is dropped by Buchanan, as are also the far-fetched stories of King Ptolemy's ambassadors, come to make a geographical description of Scotland; those of the two Spanish philosophers; of the Druids in the Isle of Man; of Fergus II. going to the siege of Rome; his

bringing thence ancient books for his share of the booty of that rich city, etc. All this is left out by Buchanan, though Boece says he had it all from his Veremund, etc. Buchanan also passes wisely over in silence the Scots assisting the Britains against Julius Caesar, Augustus' embassy to King Metellanus, and all the Scottish wars with the Romans till Julius Agricola's expedition. Buchanan makes no mention of Boece's Came-lodunum in Scotland, and¹ restores it, as well as the Brigantes and Silures, to the Britains, from whom Boece had borrowed them.

VII. To pass over a number of other reformations and retrenchments made by Buchanan in Boece's lives of the forty kings, to give them an air of truth, I shall only take notice of the turn he hath given to the life of King Caractacus. Boece or his vouchers found it honourable for the Scots to make that famous prince one of their kings; and therefore, having grafted him on his forged genealogy, he gives us in his reign all that Tacitus had written of his story, turned in a dress proper for a Scotish king, with many additional exploits and circumstances of his reign, taken from Veremund and such other records. All this Buchanan knew to be absolutely groundless, and drops it accordingly; but then, not to lose quite one of the forty kings, he must retain the same name. But to obviate all objections from Tacitus, who tells us Caractacus was king of the Silures, or of South Wales, Buchanan makes quite another man of him, quite distinct from Boece's Caractacus; and accordingly, instead of twenty-six pages in folio, which Boece had filled with the heroic exploits of his King Caractacus, Buchanan tells us in two lines that his King Caractacus reduced the Æbudæ or Western Islands into order, and no more.

SEC. VII.—(4) *Buchanan's chief intention in writing his History was to support the Principles of Government of his Dialogue De Jure Regni, or the Subjects' Power to Depose and Punish their Kings.*

To prove this we need only to observe, that whereas Buchanan hath rejected or dropped a vast number of particulars of the forty kings' lives related by Boece, not only of what was visibly fabulous or false, but even of those facts which appear as probable as some of those he retained, and this out of such a desire of abridging the history of the forty kings, that he hath reduced two hundred pages that it takes up in Boece to about twenty pages; yet, as to those instances contained in Boece, of the subjects exercising a power over their kings, Buchanan is

¹ Buchan. lib. 2, p. 23, vet. edit.

so far from retrenching any of them,—though he knew they were as fabulous as the rest he had passed over,—that, on the contrary, he rather enlarges upon what Boece relates of them ; and, as a learned bishop¹ of the Church of England justly observes : ‘When Buchanan describes the barbarous assassination or murder of any of the Scotish kings, he does it with such an air of pleasure and satisfaction, as shows that he delighted to dwell on the subiect, and that the head of a slaughtered monarch could not be a more grateful spectacle to the people (*gratum populo spectaculum*) than it was to himself.’ So that he hath not passed over one single example of that kind without giving it at length, as may be seen in what he says of Nothatus, Thereus, Durstus, Evenus III., Dardanus, Lugtacus, Mogaldus, Conarius, Satrahil, Ethodius, Athireo, Natholocus, and Romachus, which makes just a third part of the forty kings, as we have already remarked,² that he had reckoned them up in his treatise *De Jure Regni*; and in the relation that he puts in Morton’s mouth, A.D. 1571, he repeats so often over the custom or right of the Scots, as he pretends, to degrade and kill their kings, that one sees he took pleasure to augment the number of them,³ and to recount the different punishments inflicted on them. And yet there cannot be shown one single instance, by any history or record before King James III., of any one of the kings of Scotland having been judicially arraigned and deposed by their subjects (for that is the question); and even what was done in the case of King James III. doth not prove it, since he was killed in battle by a faction of the nobility in open rebellion, without any form of law or judicial proceeding; and the Act that they passed afterwards to justify their attempt was only to save themselves, as hath been already observed.⁴

So the first judicial proceeding, sentence of condemnation, and formal deposition of any sovereign of Scotland, was that of Queen Mary in Murray’s Parliament, A.D. 1567. And how legal the proceedings against that princess were, even laying aside her character of their sovereign, and to say nothing of the legality of that assembly, may be easily judged by this, that she was condemned without being heard in her defence, either in person or by advocates, as she most earnestly entreated to be heard ; and that in the judgment pronounced against her, the same persons were her accusers, witnesses, and judges.

As to all the ancient examples of kings deposed that Buchanan

¹ B. Nicolson’s Scotish Historical Library, p. 115.

² *Supra*, p. 205.

³ ‘Cum tot reges, quos enumerare longum esset, majores nostri regno exuerint, exilio damnarent, carceribus coercuerint, supplicio denique affecerint,’ etc.—*Buchanan Hist.* p. 398, edit. Freebairn.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 163.

musters up, it will be found, upon examination, that they were all, without exception, either of the number of Veremund's forty kings, of whom enough hath been said, or of other posterior kings, whose accusations and process depend wholly on the sole authority of the same Veremund, related by Boece, but contradicted, as we elsewhere observed,¹ by the authority of Fordun, and of all our historians before King James III., or, in fine, of the number of those kings that were killed in battle by their competitors before the order of succession was fully regulated and fixed to the next immediate heir; but not so much as one instance can be alleged of any arraignment, judicial proceeding, or formal deposition of any one sovereign of Scotland before the month of December 1567, in the aforesaid case of Queen Mary.

But in all this, as I said before,² on occasion of King James III., I only examine matters of fact as a critic or an historian, without meddling in the least with what concerns the established civil government, or the alterations that have been made in it by our kings and Parliaments since the fifteenth or sixteenth age; the sovereign alone, with the estates of the kingdom, and no private person whatsoever, being the only proper judges of what is best for the public good, which ought to be the aim and scope of all government. And thus much as to Buchanan's so often repeated examples of kings of Scotland arraigned, judicially deposed, and punished by their subjects.

And now to conclude what concerns him. By what hath been said in these last four paragraphs, it will appear to the impartial reader that Buchanan's intention, in his history of the forty kings after Boece, was to impose on posterity as true history what he himself knew to be without any solid ground; and that one of his chief motives in writing it was to confirm the principles of the deposing power which he had laid down in his treatise *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*. As to the substance of his history of the forty kings, having shown that it hath no other foundation but that of Boece, the arguments brought against this last do equally refute that of Buchanan. And to finish what concerns it, it is remarkable that it came out in a proper juncture for such a work, to wit, A.D. 1582, whilst King James VI. was detained prisoner by a faction of the nobility; but that king was no sooner at liberty, than in a free³ Parliament, A.D. 1584, Buchanan's history, as well as the dialogue *De Jure Regni*, were both suppressed; and King James himself, in his⁴ instruc-

¹ *Supra*, p. 153.

² *Supra*, p. 150.

³ Parl. VIII. Jac. VI. Act 134.

⁴ 'Non illos Buchananis & Cnoxi famosos libellos dico : quos qui in tua usque tempora asservaverit, sentiat ille mearum legum pœnas.'—*Basilicon doron*, p. 163.

tions to the prince his son, joining Knox's libels, as he calls them, to those of Buchanan, enjoins an exact execution of the laws made against them.

I doubt not but some of the admirers of Buchanan will be shocked at the freedom which I have taken to censure so great a man; but, as I observed when I first entered upon what related to him in this essay, I am as great an admirer as any of his panegyrists of his ready wit, his eloquence, his inimitable Latin style in prose, and yet more in verse: all these rare talents render him indeed a great man in those qualities; but all these qualities may be, and frequently are, abused by those that possess them in the highest degree. The most estimable quality of all is that which enables and disposes one to make a right use of all these talents, that is, the quality of the good man; and this is what I cannot discover in his historical writings, which alone fall under my consideration in this essay, and especially those against Queen Mary, but just the contrary. This quality of a good and virtuous man certainly includes the moral virtues of gratitude, humanity, moderation, and compassion on those in distress, equity in judging, wariness, and reservedness in condemning, etc.; and this with regard had to all in general, how much more with regard had to his native sovereign, and to one who had bestowed upon him so many marks of favour, distinction, and esteem, which she continued to heap upon him as long as it was in her power to do it; and especially that of making so early a choice of him, notwithstanding the zeal she knew he had for a religion different from her own, to entrust him preferably to others, with the education of the prince her son.

Now, I ask if there is the least sign or appearance of these qualities that make the good and virtuous man in Buchanan's writings in regard of Queen Mary, from the moment she fell into adversity? Nothing can be more opposite to them than a credulity of all the most malicious reports spread against her by her greatest enemies; a forward readiness to catch at all the frailties and weaknesses so ordinary to the sex, and all imprudences so inevitable to one in so intricate circumstances as Queen Mary was in, who was continually tossed between different factions and parties, disappointed often by those she had most trusted, having none she could securely rely upon; to see him give the worst construction that malice could invent to all her words and actions; to make use of all his talents of ready invention, wit, and fluent eloquence to expose her as a Medæa, or monster of cruelty and lewdness, to the eyes of a foreign court, and indeed to all the world,—and all this without any assured proofs, or any ground but conjectures on the

resemblance of the writings in Morton's box to the queen's hand, though, as Camden¹ judiciously observes, 'There are everywhere so many forgers that can so cunningly imitate and counterfeit other men's hands, that hardly the true can be known from the false;' and thus to insult with the bitterest satire upon a sovereign captive distressed, deprived of all that could comfort or support her amidst all her repeated misfortunes, and in a situation capable to have touched and mollified the heart of the greatest enemy, with whom there had remained any sentiment of humanity and generosity.

By all this it appears but too plainly that all those fine maxims and sentences of morality which are admired in Buchanan's writings had not sunk deep in his own heart, though his great reading had furnished him with them, and his ready wit and noble style made it easy to him to have them present to his memory, to give them a delicate turn, and to bring them to the purpose into his conversations, letters, and other writings.

I shall not meddle here with his politics and schemes of government; but certainly he had done more wisely, as all good subjects ought, to have left the regulating of those matters to kings and Parliaments; and if one may judge by what he lived himself to see of the effects of the change in the state of his country, to which he had contributed more than any man of his rank, it could give him little satisfaction or comfort to see it torn to pieces in its very bowels, and, by the different parties and turns of affairs, become a scene of blood, rapine, and hostilities, from the time of the imprisoning and deposing the sovereign to his own death; not to speak here of its being rendered subject to, and dependent on, the motions of a neighbouring court,—all which took its rise from the oppression and captivity of the lawful sovereign, in which Buchanan had so great a hand; for those who had successively usurped her authority were easily brought into a dependence on, or, according to the phrase of the time, kept at the devotion of England, either by threatenings of restoring the queen to liberty and to her throne, or by bribes and pensions,² of which even M. George himself had his share, and that, too, proportioned rather to the service he had done to England against the mother, or could yet do to it, being about the son, than to his rank, he being the only one under the degree of an earl or lord that had £100 sterling of pension assigned to him. By these means Scotland was kept in subjection, whereas Queen Mary had a greater soul

¹ Camden, *Vit. Eliz.* p. 145.

² 'The names of those in Scotland that had pensions out of England.'—*Cotton Library Caligula*, c. 5, fol. 3.

than to truckle to any foreign power; and whilst she sat on the throne, had always preserved her crown and kingdom in that freedom and independency which her royal ancestors had transmitted to her.

But Buchanan lived to see those four regents, who after persecuting the queen had usurped her authority, perish one after another; and the last of them, Morton, after having drawn upon himself by his rapine, lewdness, and cruelty¹ the hatred and maledictions of the generality of his country, perished unlamented on a scaffold for that same crime with which Buchanan, upon accusations chiefly produced by him, had with so inhuman a bitterness defamed his sovereign. I shall say no more, but that I should not wonder that these, and such other melancholy considerations, upon a nearer approach of eternity, should have awaked in Buchanan some remorse of his writings and actions, as it is credibly² reported that they did; the rest must be left to the light of that day when all will be made manifest.

CHAPTER IV.

CONCLUSION OF THIS FIRST SECTION.

Now to bring this first section on the Scots to a conclusion. I have all along proceeded in it on the supposition of the truth or probability of the ancient settlement and monarchy in the Scotish line, as well as of that of the Irish high antiquities, as the remote antiquities of both nations are supposed by Fordun and our monastery writers, his continuators; and in that supposition, among other things, I have shown that the names, genealogy, lives, and actions, and all that particular detail which Boece from Veremund, and Buchanan from Boece, have added to the short account of the forty or forty-five first kings left us by the more ancient writers, is false and groundless, and deserves no credit; and at the same time I have endeavoured to lay open the secret springs whence these new inventions first arose. This made the chief subject of the third chapter of this section; but before I entered upon it, I endeavoured in the two preceding chapters to show that the true

¹ See the accounts of Morton in Sir James Melville's Memoirs, and in those of the four regents, published by Crawford, A.D. 1706.

² Buchanan's Vita, edit. Frebairn, p. 11.

honour of the present inhabitants of Scotland, and the antiquity of the royal line and monarchy, might be as well, if not better, sustained without these details of Boece and Buchanan as with them; so that I have ground to hope that when matters are well considered, none of the learned of my countrymen will find fault with the freedom I have taken with these modern historians.

I am rather afraid that those who are well versed in the ancient history of Britain will blame me for having enlarged too much on disproving a story which the taste of this learned age hath in great measure discredited long ago; but because there are still some who, either out of a mistaken zeal for the antiquity of the monarchy in the Scotch line, or from other motives, will not easily part with Boece and Buchanan's story of the forty kings, I was resolved (after having already shown¹ that the antiquity of the settlement of the inhabitants of the north of Britain, and of the monarchy, wants not the invention of the forty kings to support it) to go to the bottom of it, and to put in so clear a light the forgery of the vouchers on whose authority Boece and Buchanan's history of the forty kings is grounded, that the accounts they give of the barbarous usage of so many of their kings, and so many other fabulous stories, might not remain longer to be a reproach to the nation.

But as to the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots in Britain, and an ancient monarchy even in the Scotch line, laying aside the additions of Boece and Buchanan, I was long of opinion that, on supposition of the truth of the Irish high antiquities, those of the Scots in Britain might be much more probably sustained on the old system of our history, such as Fordun and his continuators had left it,—the few particulars they contain of the Scots, from Fergus I. till Fergus II., laying aside some things visibly fabulous, appearing to me less opposite to the ancient Roman and British histories, and much more easily reconcilable to them, than those long details of the lives of the first forty kings, as they were afterwards set down by Boece and Buchanan.

Therefore, after being on the one hand fully convinced, for the reasons I have set down in the last four articles, of the falsehood of the details given us by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers, of the first forty kings, and, on the other, being unwilling wholly to abandon a system of our antiquities which had been generally received among the Scots during the last three centuries and upwards, I was resolved to leave nothing untried that was consistent with truth, and might gratify my countrymen,

¹ *Supra*, Book i. c. 2, arts. 8 and 9.

attached to the antiquity of the settlement and monarchy in the Scotish line.

In order to this, my first application was to support the system of our antiquities much on the same footing on which Fordun's followers and continuators had left them, before Boece's history appeared, by endeavouring—1st. To show that if the ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland be admitted of, in that case it might be made appear that it was very probable that the Scots were settled in Britain before the Romans entered it, but without pretending to fix any precise dates of the time of the coming of the Scots into Britain, because such dates are not to be looked for among illiterate people, such as all the northern inhabitants of Europe were in those early times; and to this end I had collected as plausible authorities and reasons as, I conceive, had been hitherto produced for the early settlement of the Scots in Britain, whereof the reader will have seen a part in the second chapter of this section.

2d. With the same view, in another pretty large dissertation, I had entered into a full discussion of all the passages of the Roman and British writers, from the first time that the name of Scots is made mention of by ancient authors; and had shown, at least with probability, against Camden, Usher, and others, that all those passages might be reconciled with Fordun's system of our antiquities (admitting some corrections of it), and in particular with the settlement of the Scots before the Romans' first entry into this island, with their being forced out of Britain by the Romans after the middle of the fourth century, with their restoration in the beginning of the fifth, etc.

But all this being grounded upon the supposition of the certainty of the ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland, I must acknowledge that when I began to look more narrowly into this, as it was necessary that I should, that being the foundation of all the system of our antiquities, there arose in me so many doubts and difficulties about this, that I began to look upon all my labour as lost; for it not being doubted of that the Scots of Britain came into it at first from Ireland, it seemed very ridiculous to suppose, or to endeavour to prove, that the Scots were settled in Britain before the incarnation, if we be not sure that they were then settled in Ireland. This obliged me to lay aside all that I had written upon the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, till I should first examine the grounds of the Irish remote antiquities, that is, of the settlement of the Scots in Ireland so many ages before the incarnation, that accordingly I might be able to determine the true era of the first coming of the Scots into Britain, and of the beginning of their monarchy in this island.

This discussion engaged me into new inquiries, and these gave occasion to many new observations and new discoveries in the ancient state of the Scots, both in Ireland and Britain: all which make the subject of the second section on the Scots.

SECTION II.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE ANTIQUITY OF THE FIRST SETTLEMENT OF THE SCOTS IN IRELAND, AND IN THE NORTHERN PARTS OF BRITAIN.

Having in the preceding section on the Scots considered their settlement and government in Britain, on the supposition of their having been long before the incarnation settled in Ireland, my design in this is to examine the truth of this ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland, that being a necessary preliminary towards the discovery of the time of the first coming and settlement of the Scots in Britain, and of the beginning of their monarchy in the Scottish line in this island. This double inquiry shall make the subject of the two dissertations into which I shall divide this last section.

In the first dissertation, I shall inquire into the grounds of the remote antiquities of Ireland, and particularly into the time of the first settlement of the Scots in that island.

In the second, after a short account of the writers in general, and of some historical monuments of Scotland, I shall endeavour to fix the time of the first settlement, and of the beginning of the monarchy of the Scots in Britain.

DIS. I.—*On the Accounts that the Irish give of the Remote Antiquities of Ireland, and of the First Settlement of the Scots in that Island.*

It is with very great reluctance that I enter upon this subject, which, if I could have avoided, I certainly had not meddled with it; but it being generally agreed on that the Scots of Britain came in from Ireland, there was no treating of the subject, nor any possibility of fixing the time of their settlement in Britain, without first examining into the antiquity of their settlement in Ireland. And having ventured in this essay to call in question the common traditions of my own country, supported by the authority of all our modern historians, concerning the first

forty kings and other points of antiquity, it ought not to appear strange that I take the like freedom with the settlement of the Scots in Ireland, especially since the discussion of this last is so necessary to give light into what concerns their settlement in Britain. But having in this inquiry into the remote antiquities of Ireland nothing in my view but to endeavour to discover the truth of history, and to separate what is uncertain and contested from what is more certain and generally agreed on, I think I may so much the more justly hope that none of the learned of the Irish nation will take offence at it, that my intention is to treat the subject with that moderation and candour that becomes a sincere inquirer after truth, without presuming to decide in so intricate and obscure questions as may be made about those remote antiquities,—that being a task to which I must acknowledge I am very unequal, and which none but some of the learned natives, skilled in their ancient language, with the helps of the remains of what is more authentic in their history, could with any hopes of success undertake.

And, indeed, I have often wondered that among so many truly learned and capable men who have distinguished themselves in all kinds of learning that Ireland hath produced during the last and in this age, none of them have ever applied to separate what is certain of their history, and grounded upon solid monuments of antiquity, written in times of light and learning, from what is uncertain, and hath no other foundation but the traditions or writings of their seanachies and bards, in order to give a true history of the country since the times of St. Patrick and King Leogaire, both civil and sacred; whilst others, such as Keating, O'Flaherty, etc., render all uncertain, by putting on an equal level, and delivering, and that on the sole credit of the bards, the accounts of their history from almost the deluge of Noah, with as much assurance as they do the transactions of Ireland after St. Patrick's time.

But in order to give a true history of Ireland, and for a solid foundation to it, the first thing to be done were that, according to the example of all countries of Europe who pretend to have any ancient chronicles, annals, or other historical monuments, some of the learned men of Ireland, skilled in their ancient language, would publish, as all other nations have done, and are daily doing, the most authentic historical monuments of their country,—I mean those chiefly which contain the transactions of Ireland since the time of St. Patrick; since which they had, without doubt, not only the use of letters and learning, but in some ages, such as the seventh, eighth, and ninth, Ireland appears to have been more famous for learning and learned

men than most other nations; and by consequence, it is natural to expect that they should have had as good monuments of history, civil and ecclesiastical, as any other country. And though by the Danish invasions and other accidents many valuable pieces of that kind may have perished, there are, no doubt, still enough remaining to make some volumes of collections of historical monuments: such, among others, are the chronicles of Tigernach, the annals of Ulster, the synchronisms of Flannus, the annals of Inisfall, etc.; and the loss which they¹ complain they have already suffered of so many others, by different accidents, should be a new motive to engage them to publish what as yet remains, to hinder them from having the same fate. And I cannot but add, that it is extremely surprising to see, that though there are very few nations that pretend to so ancient monuments of history as the Irish do, yet they should be the only people in Europe that have never as yet published any original history or chronicle of their country written before these two or three last ages. But leaving that to the consideration of the learned natives of Ireland, zealous for its honour, I return to the inquiry into the remote antiquities of that island, and the time of the first settlement of the Scots in it.

There are two opposite opinions concerning the time of the first coming in and settlement of the Scots in Ireland; the one is that of the generality of the modern Irish writers, who, relying on the authority of their bards, seanachies, and poets (which are but different names of the same kind of men), make no distinction betwixt the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, or Milesians, that came into it after the four first colonies, and the Scots, and pretend that these Milesians or Milesian Scots came into Ireland, some say ten, some twelve, some fourteen centuries before the incarnation; and that at the same time they set up a monarchy, whereof Heremon, son to Milesius, was the first king.

The other opinion is that of Camden and other learned men, who make a great distinction betwixt the ancient inhabitants of Ireland and the Scots; and as they are persuaded that Ireland was first planted from Britain in the earliest times, so they hold that the Scots were not of the number of the ancient inhabitants of that island, but originally a foreign people, distinct from the ancient inhabitants, and who came not into it till after the times of the incarnation. And I myself have known some of the most learned and judicious of the Irish nation that I ever was acquainted with of the same opinion; and after all the inquiry I could make into

¹ Colgan. *Praefat. Vit. Sanctorum Hyberniæ.*

this matter, by all the best authority and reasons I could discover, I cannot but be of the same sentiment, that the Scots were not of the number of the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, but a foreign people that came not into it till about the times of the incarnation, or after it, as I shall endeavour to show in its proper place.

Now, because the greatest objection that is made against this opinion of the Scots not being the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, nor the same with the Milesians, is drawn chiefly from the histories, accompanied with chronologies, genealogies of the Irish kings and great men of the Milesian race, continued down from Milesius till St. Patrick's time, and forwards, that have been published by Keating, O'Flaherty, and other modern Irish writers, taken, as they tell us, from the poems and other pretended ancient writings of their bards and seanachies, I shall therefore begin by inquiring into the grounds of the accounts of these remote antiquities delivered by them; but I shall do it, as I said before, with the reservedness that becomes a candid inquirer, and content myself to propose the objections and difficulties that occur to me about the authority of them, and the reasons that hinder me to give credit to them, after I shall, in the first place, for greater clearness, have set down certain heads that generally all agree upon as to the first plantation and ancient inhabitants of Ireland.

That Ireland was inhabited in the earliest times there is no doubt; and I think it can be as little doubted that the first inhabitants of it came from Britain, in its neighbourhood, as those of Britain came from the nearest coasts of the Gauls, and of other countries of the continent opposite to it. For thus, from place to place, the world was at first planted by degrees after the deluge; men, as they multiplied, being obliged to march forward to the new habitations in the neighbourhood, and therefore to advance not only on the same continent over rivers, but to transport themselves over the narrow passages of seas into the neighbouring islands or lands; but at first, and in the earliest times, for want of skill of navigation, only to such lands or islands as they could discern from their own coasts, before they durst venture upon sea-voyages out of the sight of land.

This, and the conformity of languages and customs betwixt the British and Irish in ancient times, makes it much more probable¹ that the first inhabitants of Ireland came from Britain than from Spain, or any other great distance; and these same reasons prove that the first and most ancient

¹ Camden, Britan. ed. Lond. in 4to, tom. ii. p. 756.

inhabitants of Ireland must have come from the northern parts of Britain, that is, either from the point of land called the Mull of Galloway, or from Cantyre, by the lesser islands that lie betwixt it and Ireland, all in sight one of another, and the more remote of them in sight of Ireland, and at no great distance from it. And in effect we are told that the Irish seanachies¹ bring some of their first colonies after the deluge from the north of Britain, that being the nearest coast. In process of time, when men became more used to navigation, it is not unlike there might come to Ireland new colonies from Spain, as well as from the vast continent of the north.

I conceive also that it cannot be doubted but that before the times of the incarnation there was some kind of government in Ireland; and by consequence, as the most ancient of all governments, and that of which a rude people is only capable, is that of a king, or a single chief or leader, that kind of government was in use in Ireland;—not that they had one monarch of all the island, but many little kings, as we see there were in Britain, and meet with among all nations in the earliest times, and among the people found out in later ages at their first discovery. There were probably also among them, as among the Gauls and Germans, some uncertain traditions of more memorable transaetions. All this may be allowed to the ancient inhabitants of Ireland before the times of Christianity, or to any other uncultivated nation before they had poliey or the use of letters among them, provided always that no particulars be alleged to have been preserved of the dates or circumstances of old transactions, no more than any sure series or succession of kings, or of their descents or genealogies, at any distance of time, past the memory of men, before the introduction of the use of letters.

As to the settlement of the Scots in Ireland, it is generally agreed on also that they were already come into that island, and settled, in the first ages of Christianity, and perhaps a little before, or at least about these times, as I shall have occasion to observe, though Camden² places the coming in of the Scots into Ireland later, because there is no word of them in ancient writers till the second or third age.

This being premised, I shall in this first dissertation propose, 1st. The difficulties that I meet with, or objections that may be made against the remote antiquities of Ireland, containing the different reasons and authorities that hinder learned men from

¹ O'Flaherty, Ogygia; Keating, etc.

² Camden, Britan. ed. Lond. 4to, p. 759.

giving credit to them, and that seem rather to prove that, as the learned Waræus¹ says, those circumstantial accounts which their modern writers give of their ancient history are the workmanship or invention of writers of later ages. 2d. I shall endeavour to show that, though we should grant that these remote antiquities, and even what is related of the Milesian race in general, were probable, that would not prove that these Milesians were properly the Scots, but that it seems rather certain that the Scots were not settled in Ireland till about the times of the incarnation, or even after it.

CHAPTER I.

CONTAINING THE DIFFICULTIES AND DOUBTS WHICH OCCUR IN THE PARTICULAR ACCOUNTS THAT THE MODERN IRISH WRITERS, SUCH AS KEATING, O'FLAHERTY, AND OTHERS, GIVE, ON THE CREDIT OF THEIR BARDS AND SEANACHIES, OF THE REMOTE OR HIGH ANTIQUITIES OF IRELAND.

I mean by the remote or high antiquities of Ireland, as I have already observed, all those particular and circumstantiated details that these and other Irish writers have set down, not only of the first plantations and four first colonies after the flood of Noah, but in particular of that of the Milesians coming in from Spain to Ireland, and there setting up a monarchy above ten or twelve centuries before the incarnation; with the details they give of the names, genealogies, chronology, successions, reigns, and actions of those Irish monarchs, from Heremon, their first king, till Leogaire, who lived in the fifth century, when St. Patrick preached the gospel in that island.

My intention is to propose in this chapter the difficulties and doubts that occur in these remote antiquities, and the reasons which seem to render the opinion of Waræus and of other learned men very probable, who pretend that all or most of these particular accounts, especially of what passed in Ireland before the incarnation, are the inventions of writers of posterior ages.

In order to put this matter in a better light, I shall reduce these doubts or difficulties and reasons to the following heads:—

The first occasion of doubt is the particular detail of these antiquities, such as their modern authors assure us are contained in what they call their most ancient writers.

¹ Waræus, de Antiq. Hybern. Praef. p. I.

The second arises from the account that they give us of the means by which their antiquities were preserved and conveyed down, and of the ancient polity and literature of the Irish.

3d. Some testimonies of the most ancient writers that mention the Irish, and of the most learned among the modern, by which it appears that the inhabitants of Ireland were unpolished, barbarous, and without the use of letters, in the first ages of Christianity.

4th. That, in all appearance, the use of letters was not introduced into Ireland till the preaching of the gospel among them, in the fifth century of Christianity.

5th. That even supposing, against what hath been said, that the Irish had received the use of letters before the fifth age, the character of the authors of their remote antiquities, to wit, of the bards, suffices to raise doubts against what they might have written.

6th. The uncertainty of the remote antiquities of Ireland appears by the several alterations that have been made in them at different times.

7th. Their continuing to avoid the publication of their pretended original ancient histories, chronicles, poems, etc., in literal and faithful transactions, such as they are, without adding or retrenching, gives new grounds to suspect the credit of them.

ART. I.—*A Short Account of the Irish Remote Antiquities.*

The first difficulty against the credit of these antiquities is the detail in which they are delivered, with particular facts, names of persons and places, and dates of time, all pretended to be taken from what they esteem their best records of ancient history. For from this we may easily learn the characters of the writers of these pretended ancient monuments, and be able to judge what credit is due to men that had the confidence to deliver the most remote antiquities in a circumstantiated detail that none, except the sacred writers inspired by God, ever pretended to. Hence Camden¹ says pleasantly enough of them, ‘that if what the Irish writers relate of their antiquities be true, those of all other nations, if compared with them, are but new, and as of yesterday. For they tell us that Cæsarea, niece to Noah,’ etc.

The Irish writers begin their history not only from the coming of Cæsarea (Ceasrach), niece to Noah, into Ireland

¹ Camden, *Hybernia*, p. 32, edit. Amsterdam: ‘Si verum sit quod Hyberni tradunt historici non immerito hæc Insula Ogygia, i.e. perantiqua Plutarchi dicta fuit. A profundissima enim antiquitatis memoria historias suas auspicantur, adeo ut præ illis omnis omnium Gentium antiquitas sit novitas & infantia. Cæsaream enim quidam Noachi neptim antediluvium hanc incoluisse tradunt,’ etc.

before the deluge, which is all the antiquity that Camden remarks, but their most approved writers, such as *Leabhair Dromnasnachta*, or book with the white cover, inform us, according to Keating,¹ that Cain's three daughters had long before Noah taken possession of Ireland ; and that the eldest of these ladies, called Bamba, gave her name to that island. It is true, Keating, in relating this and such other antediluvian accounts of Ireland, treats them as fabulous ; but a late Irish writer,² assuring us that the *Leabhair Dromnasnachta* is quoted by all their antiquaries as a most ancient and very authentic piece of antiquity, written in the time of their pagan ancestors, it is no rash judgment to suspect the credit of the ordinary writers of their antiquities, since one of their most ancient and authentic books contains, even in Keating's judgment, the most fabulous and romantic relations.

The story³ of Ceasrach, niece to Noah, though related by the *Psaltar Cashel*, together with the other particulars of the antediluvian inhabitants of Ireland, is rejected, says Keating, by their best antiquaries, and with reason ; but what becomes then of the credit of *Psaltar Cashel*, and, by consequence, of that of *Psaltar Teamhrach* or *Tara*, whereof we are told⁴ *Psaltar Cashel* was a transcript made by authority.

But the Irish writers⁵ are much more particular in their accounts of the first four colonies that came to Ireland after the deluge. The first colony was that of Partholan, who landed at Inverskene on a Tuesday, the fourteenth of the moon, in May, just 312 years, according to O'Flaherty, after the deluge. The rest of the particulars may be seen at length in Keating and O'Flaherty ; as also those of the second colony of Nemedius and his sons ; of the Clanbolg, who made the third colony ; and of the fourth, called Tuadadanana. What is most particular is, that of all these colonies (whereof the latest, according to O'Flaherty, came to Ireland before the taking of Troy) these late Irish writers confidently give us an historical detail, with as particular an enumeration of facts as if they had been transactions of three or four ages ago. In a word, they tell us the names of the chief leaders of each colony ; the precise time and place of their landing in Ireland ; the names, succession, and reigns of their kings, and their memorable actions, each one with its date ; the precise time each Lough broke out in Ireland (a circumstance not to be matched in other histories) ; the genealogies of their great men down from Noah ; the year

¹ Keating, p. 17, ed. London, 1723, from *Leabhair Dromnasnachta*.

² D. Kenedy's Genealogy, Praef. p. 25.

³ Keating, p. 20.

⁴ D. Ken. Praef. pp. 18, 19.

⁵ Keating, from p. 23 to p. 53 ; and O'Flaherty, Ogyg. from p. 163 to p. 182.

in which each colony expired or was destroyed; the precise number of years that Ireland was desert, betwixt the exit of one colony and the coming in of the following one,—and this when there was nobody there, neither bard nor other, to mark them down. And all this account of these four colonies, above two thousand years before the incarnation, of which the detail may be seen in Keating and O'Flaherty above quoted, is said to be taken from their psaltars, poets, and other surest antiquaries not as yet published.

As to the Milesian colony, they pretend to give of it as yet more circumstantial accounts; and that not only from their settlement in Spain, and next in Ireland, but of all the pilgrimages of their predecessors, down from Fenius Farsaigh (who, they say, was great-grandson to Japhet, one of Noah's sons), of his son Niul, and all his posterity; whose circuits, twice backward and forward, from Scythia to Egypt, from thence to Spain, and up and down through Europe, Asia, and Africa, may be seen at large in Keating,¹ taken, as he assures us, from the best Irish antiquaries.

They² assure us that Heremon, with the Milesian colony, arrived in Ireland precisely the first day of May, on a Thursday, and the seventh of the moon; they give us an account of all the leaders of that colony; of the harbours where each of them landed; of the Loughs that broke out on the night of their landing. In a word, from Heremon, the first king of the Milesians, they give a distinct series, or chronological history, of all their kings, down till Leogare (who began his reign A.D. 427, and during whose time the Christian faith was preached in Ireland by St. Patrick), with the number, names, genealogies, chronology of their kings, the years of their reigns, their chief battles and actions, the manner and time of each of their deaths; and all this they deliver from about two thousand years before the incarnation with as equal assurance as they do the history of Ireland since St. Patrick.

This prospect alone of the Irish antiquities suffices to breed violent suspicions in all impartial persons conversant in true ancient history, that the whole is an invention of later ages; and these suspicions are still increased by the detailed accounts of these antiquities that Keating himself (as he is lately published) hath, the most warily he could, selected out of their more ancient writers, as more likely and less absurd than the most of what they contain; and especially if it be considered that they have no other vouchers for the Milesian antiquities but those very writers who recount with an equal confidence the stories of the peopling of Ireland before the deluge as they

¹ Keating, from p. 57 to p. 89.

² O'Flaherty, pp. 84, 85, 182, etc.

do those after ; so that even Keating himself is forced to abandon them in this, though they be their writers of the first rate, such as *Psaltar Cashel*,¹ the book with the white cover,² and their poets.

ART. II.—*The Second Objection drawn from the means by which the Irish pretend their High Antiquities were preserved and conveyed down ; and of their Ancient Literature and Polity before the times of Christianity.*

As all ancient histories depend upon the credit of their vouchers, so, besides other qualities, the more the transactions related in a history are ancient and extraordinary, the more ancient must also be the vouchers that attest them, and of a more extraordinary character. Hence the Irish seanachies, that relate the story of the antediluvian inhabitants of Ireland, furnish us with antediluvian authors, and tell us of four of those ancient inhabitants that lived before and after the deluge, as Keating says some ancient mss. of Ireland record. But since Keating informs us that these antediluvian authors, with their stories, are rejected by their best antiquaries, I shall pass them over, and come to what they relate seriously, as the true account of the antiquity of letters and learning among their predecessors.

As the accounts of their antiquities far surpassed those of all other nations, except what is recorded in the Scriptures, so their bards, as if they had had it in their choice when to begin the literature among the Irish and their predecessors, thought fit to fix on the highest antiquity, and at the very origin of the different languages soon after the flood of Noah ; and the following instances of it are seriously related by those that they esteem their most genuine antiquaries, and received by Keating and others of their modern writers.

They tell us,³ then—1st. That one Fenius Farsaidh, great-grandchild to Japhet, Noah's son, and predecessor of the Milesians, set up a school of learning in the plains of Senaar, about one hundred and fifty years after the deluge ; and having two tutors under him, Gaodel and Jar, he there formed the Irish tongue, and first invented the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Irish letters. A particular detail of this school may be seen in Keating at length, from p. 59 to p. 64.

But what at first would seem very surprising is, that this story of Fenius Farsaidh's having formed the first Hebrew, Greek, and Latin alphabets, with the Beth-luis-nion, an Ogum, or Irish alphabet, is seriously related as an historical fact by Toland,⁴ another Irish writer, so famous for his incredulity in

¹ *Vid.* Keating, p. 20.

³ *Ibid.* p. 59, etc.

² *Ibid.* p. 17.

⁴ Toland's Posthumous Works, tom. i. p. 38.

regard of other facts, the best attested that ever were recorded. It is true, Toland endeavours to mend the matter; and, being sensible of the absurdity of this Fenius' having formed the Greek and Latin alphabets so many ages before the Greeks and Latins were a people, he reforms the bard Forchern's story of it (according to the usual custom of posterior bards, who, as they happened to live in times of more light and learning, reformed the traditions of their ignorant predecessors), and would have us believe that Forchern's meaning was only that Fenius invented the first letters, in imitation of which the alphabets of these nations were made. And doth not the giving credit even to that, on the bare testimony of a bard whose absurdities he is forced to explain away, seem at first very surprising in a person of so noted incredulity as Toland?

But the surprise will be less when it is considered that Toland's incredulity was chiefly in regard of revealed facts, or the objects of faith; for it being a property of faith, according to the apostle,¹ ‘to cast down all imaginations,’ or reasonings, ‘and everything that exalts itself against the knowledge of God, and to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ,’ this seems an intolerable yoke to men of Toland's principles, there being nothing more opposite to that unlimited liberty of free-thinking, upon which he chiefly valued himself; whereas all that could raise a sublime notion of the engine of mere man, without any extraordinary assistance of Almighty God, served admirably to the purpose of free-thinkers. And nothing appearing a stronger evidence of the natural extent of man's capacity than to find out, merely by his own application and study, so surprising an art as that of painting (if I may so say), or of rendering sensible and lasting, by figures or characters, bare thoughts or sounds of articulate words, so as to convey them to any distance of time or place, the story of Fenius Farsaidh's having made this wonderful discovery, and being the first inventor of letters, was more easily swallowed down by Toland, though he had no other ground to believe it, nor that there ever was such a man as Fenius Farsaidh in being, but the relation of this Forchern, a bard, and though he himself acknowledges² that the bards in general were a set of men both partial and mercenary to a scandalous degree.

Besides that, Toland, who set up so much for a man versed in all kind of literature, could not, I suppose, be ignorant that the most judicious among ancient writers after Eupolemus, quoted by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, looked upon the invention of alphabetical letters as having been at first communicated by God Himself to Moses and the Israelites,

¹ 2 Cor. x. 5.

² Toland, Posthum. Works, p. 50.

and from them derived to the Phœnicians, from whom the Greeks at first received it.

A new proof that the invention of letters was no ancienter than Moses, and that the Pentateuch is the most ancient book in the world, may be drawn from the ignorance we are in of all past transactions, not only before Moses' time (except what is contained in the Pentateuch), but of all certainty of history before the siege of Troy, about three hundred years after Moses; which answers the time that Cadmus (who is believed to be contemporary to King David) is supposed to have brought the first letters from Phœnicia to Greece. And since it cannot be doubted of but that the desire to perpetuate their memory was no less natural and vehement in men before Moses' time than after it, how comes it that we have no remains of any certain account of what passed in these times, besides what is in the Scripture?

I do not pretend here to enter upon Toland's principles as to what concerns religion, but leave that to the divines, who have abundantly discussed his principles on those matters. I am only concerned at present in historical facts, and cannot but observe the strange bent of the reasonings of this person, who pretends to be wholly governed by reason, and yet could believe, or seem to believe, that Fenius Farsaïdh was the first inventor of letters, without any other ground but that of the bards, whom he looked upon, as we have seen, as venal souls; and this in opposition to the solid arguments which prove the first use of letters to have been a particular gift of Almighty God to mankind, in the person of Moses.

But it is very likely that the chief reason that determined Toland to vouch the story of Fenius, and other bardish inventions of the same kind, that suppose the ancient use of letters among the Irish, was to put in credit the pretended writings of the ancient Irish Druids in times of paganism, in order to make a handle of them to rally and run down what he calls priestcraft. And so we shall meet him again more than once chiming in with the bards for the ancient use of letters among the Irish.

The second instance¹ of learning among the Irish is placed about an age after the settlement of the Milesians in Ireland, to wit, that twelve hundred years before the incarnation they had public professors of learning in King Tigernma's time; and those already in so great esteem, that they were allowed the precedence next to their kings, and only one colour less in their robes. This was about one hundred years before the taking of Troy, and four hundred years before the first

¹ Keating, p. 127; D. Ken. p. 20, Praef.

Olympiad, the two most ancient epochs of profane history. So it is no wonder that a late Irish writer¹ falls in a rapture at the thought of such a distinguishing character of his country. ‘Could a nation,’ says he, ‘be called barbarous, that, so many ages before Christ, set such a value upon learning, etc.?’

The third proof of ancient literature among the Irish, and of the care they had of preserving the memory of past transactions, is, according to their modern writers, and Toland² among others, that about nine hundred and sixty-seven years before the birth of Christ, King Eocha Ollam-Fodla ordered all the transactions of his royal ancestors, from Fenius Farsaith to his own time, to be reviewed; and in order to digest them, he appointed a committee of nine, or an assembly of three kings, three druids, and three poets or bards, to meet every third year at a parliament at Tara, to examine and digest them for the benefit of posterity. An account of this parliament and assemblies at Tara may be seen at length in Keating, from p. 132 to p. 143, where the curious reader will be no doubt surprised to find, among other things, an order, discipline, politeness, and especially a progress of learning, but above all a singular care of the annals and histories among the Irish, about two hundred years before the founding of Rome, that will scarce be met with in most other nations in the most polished ages.

I omit other instances that they³ give of the progress and encouragement of learning in Ireland, in times when other nations were generally in ignorance and barbarity, and refer my reader to their own writers; but I cannot forbear to mention that, in order to confirm the matter, and to canonise these pagan antiquities, we are told,⁴ that they were judged of that importance by St. Patrick, apostle of Ireland, that, contrary to the custom of all other apostolical preachers, amidst his labours in the gospel, he thought it became him to list himself in the committee of nine, with two other bishops, amidst their bards and kings, and digest the historical and genealogical collections of their pagan antiquities.⁵

The first thing that is to be remarked on these high pretensions to so surprisingly ancient literature and polity is, that the invention proves that the Irish were conscious to themselves that an early literature and polity were absolutely necessary to gain credit to their high antiquities; so that if they were deprived of that support, it would seem that even in

¹ D. Ken. Gen. Praef. p. 21.

² Toland’s Hist. of Druids, p. 50.

³ Keating, p. 147, cc. 217, 252; D. Ken. Praef. pp. 19, 20, etc.

⁴ Keating, p. 335.

⁵ D. Ken. Praef. p. 118.

their own judgment the credit of their antiquities would be quite sunk.

And yet, in the second place, it is evident that all those instances that they give of the early settlement of learning and polity among them are yet more incredible if they be well considered, and more liable to exceptions, and so stand as yet more in need of new proofs to support them, than those very antiquities which they are brought to support and authorize, and, indeed, serve only to prove the fertility of the bards' imaginations in invention.

For, however the high antiquities of Ireland, or the detailed accounts they give of the settlement and history of their several ancient colonies, and among others of that of the Milesians, must be all looked upon absolutely as uncertain, whilst hitherto no ancient writer appears within two thousand years of the time to attest or support them; yet they have at least this advantage, above the accounts that the Irish give in so many instances of their having been so anciently polished with learning, that these instances of learning being equally destitute of all credible testimonies from ancient authors or records to support them, can be more plainly shown to be groundless, as well by the concurrent testimonies of ancient writers, and by the most learned among the modern that have examined into them, as by the terms that the Irish make use of in learning, and by the proper characters of their letters, such as have hitherto been published,—by all which it appears that Ireland, far from having the advantage over the Greeks and Romans of a more early settlement of learning and polity, as a late Irish writer boasts,¹ on the contrary it remained much longer in ignorance, and without the use of letters, than most of the other western countries, who acknowledged they were beholden for their being civilised to the Romans.

ART. III.—That the Inhabitants of Ireland were still unpolished and barbarous, and, by consequence, without the use of Letters, in the first Ages of Christianity, according to all the Accounts we have of them from the most Ancient Writers, and in the Opinion of the most learned among the Moderns.

The only credible accounts we can have of any country, in ancient times, is from those ancient writers that describe the several nations as they came to be known, and had taken their accounts from those on the place or in the neighbourhood. We have nothing of Ireland in the more ancient geographers

¹ Ken. Gen. Praef. p. 26.

but its bare situation or position. Strabo (who wrote under Augustus and Tiberius) is the first that gives some particulars of the inhabitants of that island. The first account he gives of their manners and customs in his time is just the same that the first discoverers of America, and of the remotest coasts of Africa, give of these new-found inhabitants in their natural state, to wit, that they were barbarous and wild men. Those, says Strabo,¹ that now-a-days make a survey of the different countries of the world, find nothing to relate of any country beyond Ireland, which lies to the north, and near Britain, and is inhabited by men entirely wild (*ἀγρίων τελέως ἀνθρώπων*).

The same author, speaking afterwards of the Britains, tells us that in his time the Britains were, as to their manners and way of living, partly like to the inhabitants of the Gauls, partly more rude and barbarous than the Gauls; and then adds,² ‘As to Ireland, all I know of certainty is, that its inhabitants are more barbarous and savage (*ἀγριώτεροι*) than those of Britain;’ and, by consequence, of these three nations, the Gauls or Celtes, the Britains, and the Irish, these last were, in Strabo’s time, reputed the most barbarous. He adds some instances of their barbarous customs; but as to those I shall not insist upon them, because Strabo says he had them not well enough attested.

The next ancient writer from whom we have account of the manners of the Irish in those times, is Pomponius Mela,³ who wrote not long after Strabo in the first age of Christianity, and gives this account of them: ‘The inhabitants of Ireland are unpolished, barbarous, and ignorant of all virtues.’ Thus we see Ireland still esteemed unpolished and barbarous, and that more than a thousand years after the times that the modern writers tell us of its being so civilised.

All that they answer⁴ to this is, that Strabo or Mela had no opportunities to be informed of the condition and manners of the Irish. But for this I refer them to a modern writer⁵ of their own, who assures us, after Tacitus⁶ in the life of Agricola, that the ports of Ireland were better known, and more frequented by the merchants, than those of Britain, as being much the more numerous, and the more safe, and perhaps not inferior to any in Europe. Now Strabo and Mela had a fair occasion to be informed of the state of Ireland by the resort of the Britains to Rome, who could not but know the condition of Ireland, in their neighbourhood, as well as others that frequented their ports; and Strabo makes particular mention

¹ Strabo, pp. 114, 115.

² Ibid. lib. 4, p. 201.

³ Pomp. Mela, cc. 3, 6.

⁴ Pref. to Keating, pp. 2, 3.

⁵ Ken. Pref. p. 27.

⁶ Tacit. p. 233.

of the Britains coming to Rome. Now it doth not seem likely that Strabo and Mela, having such opportunities, could be so grossly mistaken as to impute so great barbarity to Ireland in the first age of Christianity, if it had been then, and for so long a tract of time before, polished with arts and sciences, as the late Irish writers pretend it was; for it cannot be doubted but those Roman writers, having for their peculiar design in their books to give an account of the several foreign countries, and to remark what was more rare and singular in them, would use their utmost diligence to be rightly informed.

But what shall be said of Tacitus' account of the manners of the Irish in his time? for he is the next author that mentions them. He had his informations from Agricola, his father-in-law; and Agricola had his account of Ireland from no less an author than one of the Irish lesser kings; and yet, far from mentioning polity or learning among the Irish, Tacitus, after describing the barbarous Britains—such the Romans esteemed those who had not been cultivated as yet by their discipline—as an unpolished and rude people, *dispersi & rudes*, tells us¹ the Irish in their manners were much the same as these Britains. Tacitus adds to this, that he had often heard from Agricola, that with one single legion and a few auxiliaries, Ireland might have been easily conquered and subjected to the Roman empire. This shows how mean an opinion Agricola had of the inhabitants of Ireland in comparison of those of Caledonia or the north of Britain, who at that very time, under their leader Galgacus, gave work to all the Roman legions and auxiliaries in Britain; not but Ireland was probably much more populous than the north of Britain, but because the inhabitants of Ireland, being more rude and unpolished, were more ignorant of the military art, and of all parts of polity and discipline.

We have no more ancient writers that speak of the manners of the Irish, before they received Christianity in the fifth age, except Julius Solinus, who by some is placed in the second age after the incarnation, by others in the third; and Solinus' account of the manners of the Irish in those days agrees with that of Strabo and Mela. The manners of the Irish, says Solinus,² are inhuman and rude. He adds to their being inhospitable, a new character which no former writer had given them, to wit, that of their being warlike; in all appearance because by this time (the third age) the Scots were settled among them, and began to make inroads on Britain,

¹ ‘Ingenia cultusque hominum [in Hybernia] non multum a Britannia differunt.’—*Tacit.* p. 233.

² ‘Hybernia inhumana ritu incolarum aspera. Gens inhospita & bellicosa; fas & nefas eodem animo ducunt.’—*Solin.* c. 36, p. 62, edit. Basil. 1538.

though their name was not perhaps yet known at Rome, where it is thought Solinus wrote. What he adds of their making no difference betwixt right and wrong, is a clear proof of their being as yet entirely barbarous, and a full conviction of the fable of Ugane-more's laws,¹ pretended to have been made seven or eight hundred years before Solinus.

Thus I have gone through all I could meet with of ancient writers that give any account of the state of Ireland before Christianity was planted in it in the fifth age, and by all of them it appears it was still a barbarous and uncultivated nation. I come now to examine the opinion of the learned in modern times, since the revival of the study of critical learning; and we shall find that they are no less unanimous than the ancients in asserting that the Irish of old were uncultivated by polity or letters.

Camden, an author, in the judgment of one of the latest abettors of the Irish antiquities,² of great esteem and reputation, and, which makes more to our purpose, one, says this writer, who had taken a strict, particular, and full information of the Irish antiquities,—Camden,³ I say, after having told us that he could not think that the Romans ever entered Ireland, adds, ‘that it had been a happy thing for Ireland that the Romans had subdued it; for that had been,’ says he, ‘a sure means to civilise it and deliver it from barbarity; since, wherever the Romans became masters of any nation, they cultivated and civilised it. Nor was there anywhere in Europe any knowledge of polity, of civilised manners, or of letters, but where the Romans governed.’ That is to say, in plain terms, that since the Romans never ruled in Ireland, there was neither polished manners nor knowledge of letters there in ancient times. In short, Camden looks upon the barbarity and ignorance of the Irish in ancient times as a thing so certain, that he makes use of that as a proof to show that the Romans had never governed in that island. Accordingly, Camden⁴ looks upon the Irish antiquities, and in particular on the Scots being settled in Ireland before the incarnation, as fabulous, and is of opinion that the name of the Scots was not heard of till the third age at soonest.

Before I proceed to the next authority, I cannot but observe

¹ Ken. Geneal. Praef. p. 22.

² Ibid. p. 6.

³ ‘Animum vix inducere possum ut hanc regionem [Hyberniam] in Romanorum potestatem ullo tempore concessisse credam. Faustum sane felixque Hyberniæ fuisset, si concessisset: certe barbariem exuisset: ubicunque enim Romani victores erant, victos humanitate exculerunt. Nec sane alibi per Europam, humanitatis, litterarum & elegantiarum cultus, nisi ubi illi imperarunt.’—*Camd. Hybernia*, p. 33, Amstelod. edit. Janson. iu fol. p. 33.

⁴ *Camd. Britan.* pp. 50, 51, edit. Amstelod.

that it is no small argument against the credit of the high antiquities and ancient learning of Ireland, that one so well versed in all kind of antiquities, and so perfectly acquainted with all the remains of the writers of Ireland, as the famous Archbishop Usher was, and an Irishman by birth, hath never said one word of their high antiquities, or of their ancient monarchs before Christianity, neither in his *Annales Sacri*, where he sets down the origins and successions of all ancient certain monarchies and commonwealths, nor even in his antiquities of the churches of Britain and Ireland, where he gives us at length all that he could find of ancient stories concerning the Scots in Ireland or in Britain, nor in any other book I could ever meet with. But he was too wise to hazard the reputation he had justly acquired among the learned, of one of the best antiquaries of his time, by countenancing any such uncertain stories as the high antiquities of Ireland. And far from believing the Scots were the ancient inhabitants of that island,¹ he joins in with Camden's opinion, and proves that the name of Scots was not heard of till some ages after the incarnation.

The next testimony I shall bring is, as yet, more evident, and of greater weight, than that of Camden. It is that of Sir James Ware or Waræus, one of the most learned and best skilled in the Irish antiquities, and at the same time one of the most diligent inquirers after them that Ireland hath produced these many years, as appears not only by his books published, *De Antiquitatibus Hyberniae*,² and *De Episcopis Hyberniae*,³ but more by his work *De Scriptoribus Hyberniae*,⁴ and most of all by a most curious collection he made of all he could find of Irish MSS. relating to their history or antiquities, in the search of which it appears he spared neither pains nor expense. The catalogue of his MSS. was first printed by itself in quarto, and again in folio, and may be seen in the great collection of the MSS. of England and Ireland, printed at Oxford; and the MSS. themselves are now in the possession of the Duke of Chandos.

The judgment of a gentleman of so great a capacity as Waræus, and so versed in the antiquities of his country, will be no doubt of incomparably greater weight in this debate, with impartial and learned men, than the accounts that are given of these remote antiquities by more credulous writers, copying one after another, and oftentimes at second-hand, and who appear to have had neither the opportunities which this

¹ Usher, *Antiq. Britan.* p. 380, fol. Lond. 1687.

² Edit. Lond. in 8vo, A.D. 1658.

³ Edit. Dublin, A.D. 1665.

⁴ Edit. Dublin, A.D. 1639.

learned man had, nor his skill in discerning authentic monuments of history from the inventions of bards.

The first place where Waræus gives his opinion of the Irish writers, and of the learning and antiquities of Ireland before the conversion of Ireland to Christianity, is in the preface of his book *De Antiquitatibus Hyberniae*, in these words:¹ ‘It is most certain that there remains very little knowledge of what passed in Ireland before the preaching of the gospel there; neither am I ignorant that the most part of what is delivered by writers concerning those ancient times before St. Patrick’s coming to Ireland, is rejected by several learned men as fictions and fables; and it is to be remarked that almost all the descriptions or particular accounts that are extant of matters transacted in these ancient times are of the fabric or invention of late ages. Therefore, in this inquiry I have spoken very sparingly of them,’ etc.

In this passage of Waræus, it may be remarked (1) that he acknowledges several learned men rejected the remote antiquities of Ireland as fictions and fables; and accordingly he owns (2) himself, that most of all the accounts we have of these ancient times are the productions of modern writers, and by consequence that there remains extreme little knowledge of what passed in Ireland before St. Patrick preached the gospel there in the fifth age; for this reason he begins his accounts of the Irish kings only at Leogare, who lived in St. Patrick’s time; not, perhaps, that he believed absolutely that all that was said of their former kings was entirely false and fabulous, but because he was persuaded² that the most part of all that is delivered concerning them was either fables, or so mixed with fables and anachronisms, that there was no means left to find out truth.

The second place where Waræus’ opinion of the ancient learning of Ireland appears is in his book *De Scriptoribus Hyberniae*,³ of the writers of Ireland. Certainly a person of Waræus’ erudition, of his skill, and diligence to be informed of all that concerned Ireland, could not fail to have met with or heard of what was most ancient, most curious, and most

¹ ‘Perexiguam superesse notitiam rerum in Hybernia gesturum ante exortam ibi evangelii auroram, liquido constat. Neque me latet a viris nonnullis doctis pleraque quæ de antiquioribus illis temporibus ante S. Patricii in Hyberniam adventum traduntur, tanquam figmenta esse explosa. Notandum quidem descriptiones fere omnium quæ de illis temporibus (antiquioribus dico) extant, opera esse posteriorum saeculorum. Idecirco in hac indagine de iis admodum parce locutus sum.’—*War. de Antiq. Praef.* p. 1.

² ‘Ad prædecessores Leogarii quod attinet, eos certe consilio omisi, quia pleraque quæ de iis traduntur (ut quod sentio dicam) vel fabulæ sunt, vel fabulis & anachronismis mire admixta.’—*War. de Antiq. Hybern.* c. 4, p. 20.

³ Edit. Dublin, A.D. 1639.

valuable on the subject of which he treats ; and his zeal for his country, as well as the design of his book, and his own reputation, equally required that he should set down all he could find of their ancient writers worth the taking notice of, or that deserved any credit. And yet after all his searches, it appears that he could find no writer of the general history or antiquities of Ireland worth the naming more ancient than the *Psaltaire Cashel*, written in the tenth age, as he says in this book;¹ but by what Waræus himself quotes from this *Psaltaire* elsewhere,² it must have either been written only in the eleventh age, or had additions made to it in that age. However, till this *Psaltaire Cashel*, in all Waræus' account of the Irish writers, where he passes not over the meanest biographers, there is nothing like a history of the antiquities of Ireland ; for as to the *Liber Cuana*, he only mentions it from the Ulster annals.

3d. Waræus' judgment of the learning and polity of Ireland in ancient times doth plainly appear by many other passages of his aforesaid treatise of their antiquities ; as, in particular, in the fifth chapter, where he treats designedly of the ancient schools of Ireland,³ where he shows, indeed, that schools and learning flourished in Ireland since the planting of Christianity there, but doth not so much as insinuate that there ever had been any such thing as a school, college, professor, or any learning, or even the use of letters in Ireland,⁴ till the Irish were taught the alphabet by their apostle St. Patrick, as we shall see presently. But what confirms this matter as to Waræus' opinion of the barbarous state in which Ireland was in ancient times,⁵ Waræus joins issue with Camden, and tells us 'that it had been happy for Ireland that it had been subdued by the Romans, for by that means it had been sooner delivered from its barbarousness.'

We may now, I think, conclude that by the joint testimonies of the most ancient authors who mention the state of Ireland before it received the gospel, and of the most learned among modern writers who treat of its ancient state, it is certain that Ireland was as unpolished and barbarous as other northern countries, and without the use of letters, till it received them with Christianity in the fifth age. But this will yet further appear by what we have to say in the next article.

¹ Lib. 1, c. 10.

² War. de Presul. Hybern. pp. 10, 11.

³ War. de Antiq. Hybern. c. 15, p. 74.

⁴ War. de Scriptor. Hybern. lib. 2, c. 1, p. 103.

⁵ 'Et ego quidem Camdeno assentior, quod felix faustumque Hyberniae fuisse, si in Romanorum potestatem concessisset, nam citius tunc barbariem exuisset.' — War. Antiq. Hybern. c. 20, p. 103.

ART. IV.—*That in all appearance the use of Letters was not introduced into Ireland till the Preaching of the Gospel among them in the Fifth Century of Christianity.*

That the Irish received the first use of letters with the preaching of the gospel, is proved by Waræus, from the authority of Nennius,¹ a writer of the ninth age, compared with the most ancient life we have of St. Patrick by Tirechanus, who, as Waræus supposes,² lived in the seventh age. Nennius says that St. Patrick, whilst he preached the gospel in Ireland, wrote above three hundred and sixty A B C's, or alphabets. Nennius calls them Abgetoria, or Abietoria. That by these were meant alphabets, for the use of the new converts in Ireland, is plainly shown by Waræus, from the aforesaid life of St. Patrick by Tirechanus. These are the words of Waræus: ‘Tirechanus, an ancient writer of St. Patrick’s life, not yet published, explains to us, in the following citations compared together, what is meant by the word Abgetoria. St. Patrick, says Tirechan, baptized men daily, and taught or read to them letters or Abgetories; and again, he wrote elements or letters for the use of Cerpanus; likewise, after he had baptized one Macerca, he wrote elements or letters for him, and blessed him, etc.; and having baptized one Hina, he wrote for him Abgetories, and blessed him with the blessing of a bishop. By all this I think it is certain,’ says Waræus,³ ‘that by the word Abgetoria is meant the alphabet, or first elements of letters, which St. Patrick wrote and taught his new converts in Ireland.’

The learned Du Cange,⁴ in his glossary, shows, by many authorities, that the authors of the Middle Ages made use of the words Abgatorium, Abeturium, Abecenarium, Abecedarium, made up of the three first letters of the alphabet, A, B, C, to express it, each one according to his way of pronouncing; so the Irish, who pronounce the C as a K or G, called the alphabet Abgatorium, or Abketorium.

From the authorities brought by Waræus, the learned Bollandus,⁵ having concluded naturally that the Irish had not the use of letters till they were taught it by St. Patrick, and confirmed his opinion with good reasons, Flaherty⁶ falls very warmly upon him, as if he had been the first that had

¹ ‘S. Patricius scripsit Abietoria 365, & eo amplius numero. Ecclesias quoque eod. numero fundavit.’—Nennius, c. 59, p. 113, edit. Oxon. Gale.

² War. de Scriptor. Hybern. lib. 2, c. 1, p. 103.

³ ‘Unde constat, opinor, Nennii Abgetoria significare, alphabetum sive elementa quæ scripsit & docuit S. Patricius.’—War. de Scriptor. Hybern. p. 103.

⁴ Du Cange, Glossar. tom. i. on the words ‘Abeturium,’ ‘Abgatoria,’ etc.

⁵ Act. Sanctor. Bollandi, tom. ii. Martijad diem 17, in Not. ad Vitam S. Patricii.

⁶ Ogyg. Domest. c. 30, p. 214.

advanced that opinion, without reflecting that Camden had declared for it long before; and that Sir James Ware, from whom Bollandus had it, proves it by the most ancient legend they have of St. Patrick's life. As to Flaherty's proofs for the ancient use of letters among the Irish, we shall by and by consider them. Meantime, to confirm Bollandus, and these other learned men's opinion, I shall further add one proof, which I conceive will appear of weight with impartial readers.

I desire, then, it may be considered that in the same manner as though we had no other argument from ancient history to prove that the Latins or Romans had the first use and knowledge of letters and sciences from the Greeks, than the bare names of which the Latins make use in letters, arts, and sciences, and by which they express them, that alone would abundantly suffice to demonstrate that the Latins had originally the knowledge of letters, arts, and sciences from the Greeks, since they still express them in Greek terms, and have no other proper expression for them,—as *grammatica, rhetorica, philosophia, logica, mathematica, politica, chirurgia, physica, etc.*

In like manner, although we had no other proof to show that the Irish had the use of letters originally from the Latins, or from those that spoke the Latin tongue, but the proper terms by which the Irish in their vulgar language express them, *v.g.* a letter, a book, to read, to write, etc., this would alone suffice to convince all unprejudiced persons that the Irish had the first use of letters, and were taught to read and write originally by the Latins, or by those that spoke that language. Now it being agreed on that the Romans never entered Ireland, the Irish could not have learned these terms immediately from them, but must needs have been taught them, with the things meant by them, by St. Patrick and the other first preachers of the gospel, who all of them knowing the Latin tongue, and finding no expressions or terms in the Irish language for letters, book, reading, writing, etc., as being all things of which the Irish had never any use before, they naturally expressed them in Latin terms, the only ones they had for them themselves, giving them only an Irish inflexion; so they called *littera, lictar; liber, leabar; lego, lcagmi; scribo, scriabmi; leaghama*, to read; *scriobam*, to write, etc., in the same manner as they were forced to make use of Latin terms with an Irish inflexion for all sacred things belonging to Christianity, whereof the first preachers of Christianity brought in the first use to Ireland,—such as *Criosd, Christus; erosh, crux; cagluish, ecclesia; ecile, cella; espic or easbug, episcopus; baisteadh, baptisma*; and the like.

We come now to examine the proofs that Flaherty brings of

the ancient use of letters among the Irish before they received Christianity. The first is, that they have or had many books, poems, and histories,¹ written in their pagan ancestors' times. But all that is nothing but to beg the question, and to suppose what is under debate, till these books or some of them be published to the world, with fair literal translations and documents to prove their authority and age, and to show how and where they have been preserved during so many ages.

2d. Flaherty, for a proof that the Irish had not the use of letters from the Latins, and by consequence that their letters were much ancienter than the preaching of the gospel among them, and peculiar to the Irish, tells us that their letters differed from those of the Latins and all others in name, order, character, number, and pronunciation and force. To show this, he gives from the book of Lecan (an Irish ms. about three hundred years old) the copy of the Latin alphabet, inverted and digested in a new arbitrary order, with the names of trees attributed to each letter, beginning with the three letters B, L, N, and from thence called Beth-luis-nion. And this he pretends was the ancient Irish alphabet, before they had communication with the Latins and Romans.

But when Flaherty sets about to prove the antiquity of this Beth-luis-nion, he brings for proofs stories more incredible than the facts themselves which he intends to prove by them. Flaherty tells us, then, the story we made mention of already from Keating and Toland, that the first author of this alphabet was Fenius Farsaidh, who composed, says Flaherty, the alphabets of the Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, the Beth-luis-nion and the Ogum. This Fenius Farsaidh (as we said before) was, according to the Irish seanachies, great-grandchild to Japhet, son to Noah, and lived in Noah's own time, about one hundred years after the deluge. For this piece of antiquity Flaherty quotes one Forcherne,² an Irish poet, who, as a late Irish writer³ informs us, lived one hundred years before the incarnation. Now, not to ask how this poet Forcherne or Feirtcherne, as old as he is placed, knew so distinctly things past above two thousand years before the time in which he is classed, it may at least be inquired by what spirit of prophecy this Fenius Farsaidh composed the Greek alphabets so long before Cecrops and Cadmus, and that of the Romans some 1700 years before the Romans were a people. And will the authority of Lecan, a ms. of about three hundred years, convince the learned of so rare a discovery as that of an Irish writer one hundred years before the birth of Christ?

¹ Ogygia Domestica, c. 30.

³ D. Ken. Geneal. p. 29.

² Ibid. p. 221.

But to let that paradox pass, there needs no great skill of the Irish language to show that the Beth-luis-nion is nothing else but an invention of some of the Irish seanachies, who, since they received the use of letters, have put the Latin alphabet into a new arbitrary order, and assigned to each letter a name of some tree ; and that this was not the genuine alphabet of the Irish in ancient times, or peculiar to them, but a bare inversion of the Latin alphabet.

For, 1st. The genuine Irish alphabet consists only of eighteen letters ; for so many only they make use of in that tongue,¹ viz. A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, L, M, N, O, P, R, S, T, U ; whereas in Flaherty's Beth-luis-nion there are twenty-six letters—that is, eight supernumerary, viz. Q, X, Y, Z, *oi*, *io*, *ng*, and *ea*. Of these eight there are four which are never used in the genuine Irish, viz. Q, X, Y, and Z, at least in such Irish books or MSS. as I could hitherto ever meet with or hear of ; but they are in use in the Latin tongue, and with the other eighteen letters make up the Latin alphabet ; which, therefore, the Irish bard must have had before him when he invented the Beth-luis-nion. As to the syllables *oi*, *io*, *ca*, and double letter *ng*, which are the other four letters in the Beth-luis-nion, they have no one proper character in the Irish distinct from the common alphabet, but are expressed by two of the usual letters of it ; and nothing but mere fancy could have placed them in this new alphabet as distinct letters from the other eighteen. So I think it is plain that this Beth-luis-nion was neither the genuine Irish alphabet, nor was in use among them till after the times of Christianity, when they received the use of the Latin letters, whereof this is but a bare transposition.

As to the names of trees attributed to each letter, it seems visibly the work of mere fancy, without any reason or motive, there being no resemblance in the character of these letters to these trees from whence this bard hath named them ; whereas in the languages where the names of the letters are significative, as generally those of the Hebrew, the thing meant by these letters hath often some resemblance to the figure of the letter. And as for the term ‘Feadha,’ woods, which they gave to this alphabet, it was natural to call by the name of a forest or wood an alphabet whereof each letter was metamorphosed into a tree.

Another proof which the Irish modern writers bring for the antiquity of their letters, is from the form of their characters, as being peculiar to the Irish,² and not agreeing with the Greek or Latin characters, or perhaps any other now in the world.

¹ Irish Gram. p. 299 ; Archæolog. Britan. edit. Lhugd.

² D. Ken. Pref. p. 27.

But such arguments as these are only fit to impose upon those that never saw any Latin books or characters but in vulgar print, and never had occasion to see any ms. but Irish. For if they had seen any ancient Latin mss. or characters, they would have in the first place found, by perusing those of the sixth, seventh, eighth, and following ages, down to the times of printing, as great differences betwixt the figures of letters and form of the writing in mss. of all countries, and the common print, as betwixt the usual characters in printed books and those of the Irish, and yet originally all of them derived from the ancient Roman or Latin characters or letters.

In the second place, the inspection of old Latin mss. or charters will furnish new proofs to demonstrate that the Irish had their letters originally from the Latins, or those that used the Latin characters; for all the characters of the Irish letters (without excepting the Saxon *f*, *g*, *r*, *s*,¹ which seem more extraordinary to vulgar readers) are generally to be met with in the same form in ancient mss. and charters, not only of Britain, but none of them but are in mss. of other foreign countries, who had nothing to do with Ireland. And in many countries, where nobody doubts they had the first use of letters from the Latins, the characters of old mss. differ much more from the vulgar printed characters of the Latin than the Irish do. Such are the Merovingian and Longobardic characters. For a proof of this I refer the reader to the schemes of characters, and of old writ, which he will find in the learned F. Mabillon's book, *De Re Diplomatica*, in case he have not the opportunity to inspect Latin mss., where he will generally find, even in mss. of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth ages, much the same characters or forms of letters that are made use of in the Irish tongue, and little or no difference but in the forms of abbreviations; for which, not only the people of different languages, but every different writer, may invent such characters or forms of contractions as he fancies will most abridge.

The same thing may be said as to the notes for writing secrets, called by the Irish Ogum, of which Waræus says he had some copies; and one Donald Forbis mentions others. For nobody doubts but the Irish had their notes or cyphers for writing shorthand and keeping their secrets; especially the Druids, for preserving from the knowledge of Christians the secret of their profane mysteries, made use, no doubt, of secret characters or letters, from the time that once the use of letters was introduced in Ireland. All other nations, and every private man, may have the same for keeping secrets, and those

¹ K, Z, P, R.

entirely different from their usual letters; such among the Romans were the *Notæ Tironis*, whereof a specimen may be seen in F. Mabillon's diplomatics. Trithemius also hath written a book on the subject, *De Steganographia*; so I do not well conceive for what this serves towards proving the antiquity of the Irish letters, or that they were not originally the same as the Roman or Latin character, since Waræus, who is brought in to prove that the Irish had such characters,¹ tells us that the Ogum did not contain the Irish vulgar character, but a hidden way of writing for preserving their secrets.

And thus far as to the arguments brought by Flaherty and other modern Irish writers against the opinion of the learned Bollandus concerning the ancient use of letters in Ireland, with which subject, though Flaherty² fills up about thirty pages of his *Ogygia*, yet the far greatest part is spent in useless flourishes on the origin of letters in general, and on the use and new order of the Irish new invention of Beth-luis-nion, there being little in his book besides what we have mentioned that looks like proofs of their having had the use of letters before Christianity, unless we call proofs citations of legends of St. Patrick's life, written long after his time.

After all, I do not pretend that no private person among the Irish had the use of letters before the coming in of St. Patrick, and the preaching of the gospel to them. For it may have very well happened that some of the Irish, before that time, passing over to Britain or other parts of the Roman empire, where the use of letters was common, might have learned to read and write. It might also have happened that the Druids, who were the magicians of these times, might have had certain hieroglyphic characters to express their diabolical mysteries, and that the remains of those are what Toland and others make such a noise about. But if the Irish had any distinct character or form of alphabetical letters different from those which we have above mentioned, and which were introduced to Ireland by St. Patrick, how comes it that all this time, especially within these last fifty or sixty years that the matter hath been agitated and the dispute warm about it, none of them have ever published any specimen of these peculiar Irish letters, or at least an alphabet of them, such as F. Mabillon hath given of all ancient forms of letters, and Dr. Hicks more particularly of the Runic and other northern characters?

What I designed to show in this paragraph is, that the use

¹ ‘Præter caracteres vulgares utebantur etiam veteres Hyberni variis occultis scribendi formulis, seu artificiis Ogum dictis, quibus secreta sua scribebant.’—*War. Antig. Hyb.* c. 2, p. 12.

² Ogyg. Domest. from p. 214 to p. 245.

of letters was not ancient among the Irish; that they had it from the Romans, or those that spoke the Latin tongue; and that it was so very rare, if at all, in Ireland, till after the preaching of the gospel, that it could not be properly said to have been received in that nation till then; no more than it can be properly said that Christianity was received there before St. Patrick, though it is not unlikely that some private persons may have been taught the gospel, either at home or in other countries, and believed in Christ before the preaching of St. Patrick.

Now, if the use of letters was not received in Ireland till the coming of this saint, which was during the reign of King Leogaire, how was it possible that any certain account of history of the former ages could have been preserved? Accordingly, the more famous and authentic chronicles or annals of Ireland that have hitherto appeared, though never as yet printed, generally begin the series and chronology of their kings no higher than the reign of this King Leogaire, and about the time of St. Patrick. Such are the annals of Ulster, whereof there is a fair copy, with several other mss. relating to Ireland, in the library of His Grace the Duke of Chandos, who was pleased to do me the honour to grant me access to it. These annals, which are in Irish character, begin only at the year of our Lord 444. In the same library are the annals of Tigernach. These, indeed, want some leaves in the beginning and elsewhere, and begin only about the time of Alexander the Great; but till St. Patrick's time they treat chiefly of the general history of the world, and contain but very little of Ireland. The annals of Innisfall are likewise in the same library, and contain a short account of the history of the world in general, and very little of Ireland till A.D. 430, where the author properly begins a chronicle of Ireland, fol. 9, after these words in Latin: '*Hic finit parva præscriptio de principio mundi;*' and then follows a little after: '*Logaire Mac-Neel regnavit, an. 24,*' etc., and thenceforward contains a short chronicle of Ireland, continued down until about the year 1318. These three chronicles are written in Irish character, and in the Irish language, intermixed with Latin. They were formerly collected, with many other valuable mss. relating to Ireland, by that learned antiquarian Sir James Ware, and came afterwards into the possession, first of the Earl of Clarendon, and then of His Grace the Duke of Chandos. A catalogue of them, as they were in Sir James Ware's time, is printed at Oxford, in the great collection of the mss. of England and Ireland. And lest I may be mistaken in this account of these chronicles for want of the Irish language, and having as yet had only a

transient inspection of them, I shall here set down¹ the more perfect description given of them in the printed catalogue by one skilled in the Irish tongue, and who had perused them at leisure. These annals or chronicles are the most considerable monuments of Irish history that Sir James Ware, in the thorough search which he made after such pieces in Ireland, could meet with, most of them beginning no higher the regular succession of the Irish kings, and the chronological history of Ireland, than about King Leogaire's time. This observation, together with the fabulous narrations that he observed in those MSS. pieces that pretended to give accounts of the history of that island, and of the succession of their kings in the more ancient times, were, no doubt, the motives that determined this learned antiquarian to begin the chronological account of the Irish kings no higher than King Leogaire and St. Patrick's time; and he himself, as we have already observed, gives us this remarkable reason² why he began no sooner, that the most part of the accounts of their kings, and other Irish matters preceding King Leogaire's time, were either fabulous or strangely mixed with fables and anachronisms.

I shall not here repeat the solid difficulties that the learned Dr. Stillingfleet, in his *Antiquities of the British Churches*, raises against the accounts contained in the Irish writers of their remote antiquities, but refer the reader to the places which I have here quoted,³ and in particular to the observations which he makes in his preface⁴ against their calculating so precisely by the year of the world particular facts, whilst it appears that they could have no certain rules for regulating chronological dates in ancient times.

But I cannot but set down here another objection that presents itself to me, and appears very considerable against the chronological part of their remote antiquities, and seems evidently to prove that they have been all composed in much later times, and only after the Irish had communication or intercourse with those that spoke the Latin tongue.

¹ Vol. II. Annales Ultonienses. Codex antiquissimus sermone partim Hybernico, partim Latino charactere Hybernico scriptus incipit A.D. 444. Explicit A.D. 1041, quo obiit Rodericus Cassidæus Archidiaec. Clocheren qui scripsit dictorum annalium partem posteriorem.

Vol. III. Annales Tigernachi Eirennachi (juxta Waræum) Clonmacnensis, mutili in initio. Auctor historiam universalem attingit usque ad adventum S. Patricii, inde vero res Hybernicas usque ad A.D. 1088, quo obiit, describit. Liber charactere & lingua Hybernica, etc.

Vol. xxvi. Annales Cœnobii Innisfallensis, quibus auctor leviter attingit historiam universalem a mundo condito usque ad A.D. 430. Inde res Hybernicas usque ad A.D. 1215, quo vixit, satis accuratè describit.

² 'Vel fabulae sunt vel fabulis & anachronismis mirè admixta.'—*Waræus de Antiq. Hybern.* cap. 4, p. 20.

³ Stillingfleet, *Antiq.* pp. 266, 267, etc.

⁴ *Ibid. Pref.* pp. 33, 34.

For in the same manner, as it hath been already observed, that the proper names of which the Irish, in their language, make use to express letters, a book, to read, to write, being all derived from the Latin, prove that they had the use of letters from those that spoke the Latin tongue; so also the only proper names that the Irish in their language give to each number being manifestly derived from the same numerical names of the Latin, and only altered in conformity to the Irish idiom, seem equally to prove that they had not the art of calculation or numbering, much less that of chronology, till they received it by communication with those that spoke the Latin tongue.

Thus from *unus* is derived *aon*, pronounced *eun*; from *duo*, *do* or *dha*; from *tres*, *tri*; from *quatuor*, *ceathar* or *ceitre*,—for having no *q* in their language, they make use of *c*, which is always pronounced as *k* instead of *q*; from *quinque*, *cuige* or *coige*,—the *c*, as we said, or the *g* standing for *q*, and the *n* being sunk to render the pronunciation more smooth; *se* or *she* from *sex*, dropping the *x*, which is not in use in their language; *seacht*, for *sept* or *septem*, the *pt* being altered to *cht*, more usual in their tongue; *ocht* or *ochd* is sensibly from *octo*; and so is *noi* or *naoi*, from *novem*; and yet more, *deic* from *decem*. *Fichit* or *fichid*, instead of *vighit*, from *viginti*, by the usual alteration of the letters *v* into *f*, and *t* into *d*, as Toland observes,¹ as well as of *g* into *c*, and the *n* being sunk to render the pronunciation more smooth, as we have seen it is in *cuige* for *cuinge*; so it is likewise in *ceud* or *cead*, instead of *cent*, from *centum*, for the *d* and *t* are reciprocal, as hath been already observed. The last number, *mil*, is yet more sensibly from the Latin *mille*; and all the rest of the intermediate numbers are compounded or derived from these primitive ones.

Now it is not easily to be conceived how the Irish bards could preserve any chronological account before they received the use of counting or numbering, and by consequence that of proper names for the numbers from one to a thousand; for I suppose there was no Ogum for the numbers, as they pretend there was for the alphabet; and the natural way of counting by the ten fingers, or by heaps of little stones, might serve indeed well enough for the necessary uses of life in barbarous times, but could be of little or no service towards regulating chronology. So that all those precise calculations of years, of months, of the days of the month, and of the moon, in regulating their remote antiquities, and in particular, of the arrival of the Milesians in Ireland, as it is set down by O'Flaherty in his *Ogygia*, will appear rather a new objection than a proof of

¹ Toland's Hist. of Druids, p. 29, note 36.

the verity of their ancient history, to men versed in antiquity, who have observed the great variety of calculation of time among the ancients, and the disputes among the learned moderns concerning these matters.

All that we have said of the use of numbers and calculation, derived from the Latins, serves to confirm Waræus' judgment¹ of the remote antiquities of Ireland, that they were most part drawn up in much later times; this is also confirmed by the mention that is made of Adam, Cain, Noah, the Deluge, Moses, Pharaoh, etc., in their poems, psaltars, and in what they call their most ancient and most authentic monuments of history; for how could they come by the knowledge of these names but by the Holy Scriptures, or by communication with those that had read them? And how could they receive either that knowledge, or have that communication, before the Christian religion was preached in Ireland?

Before I conclude this subject, I cannot but take notice of what Toland says further of the ancient use of letters in Ireland. A great part of what he hath on this head being taken from Keating or Flaherty, or from the same sources, hath been already considered. He makes a long excursion upon a passage of Lucian, by which it appears that the surname of Ogmius² was given to Hercules in Gaul, and that he was named the ‘force of eloquence;’ but that might be true though the Gauls had not as yet the use of letters, and so might be only meant of natural eloquence, which may be found in a great degree in illiterate people. But Toland finds a relation betwixt the name of Ogmius, given to Hercules, and the Irish Ogum, whence he insinuates that the use of letters, with the language and religion, came from Gaul to Ireland.

Now, in the first place this were to contradict all the Irish bards upon the origin of letters, who, as we have observed, attribute the invention of the Ogum, or of the Irish and other letters, to Fenius Farsaidh, and pretend that the Irish descended of him brought them about with them from Egypt and Spain to Ireland. 2d. If the use of letters was in those most ancient times received in Gaul, whence comes it that in Julius Cæsar's time³ the Druids in Gaul were forced to make use of the Greek letters? 3d. If before the Roman times the use of letters was in Gaul, how comes it that no ancient inscription, nor any certain account of what passed in Gaul in ancient times, is to be found but what is taken from the Greek or Roman writers? Are there not great actions said to be

¹ Waræus, de Antiq. Hybern. Praef. p. 1.

² Toland's Posthum. Works, p. 33, etc.

³ Cæsar, de Bello Gallico, lib. 6.

performed by the Gauls in ancient times and was not the desire of perpetuating their memory as natural to them as to other men? And would they have failed to have done it, as well as the Greeks or Romans, if they had equally had the means?

But to come now to the meaning of the Ogum. Waræus,¹ who had himself books concerning it, and had seen others, informs us, as we have already observed, that the Ogum was an artificial way of writing, different from the vulgar Irish characters, for keeping their secrets, a secret way of writing; in a word, a kind of cyphers unintelligible to all who had not the key of them. But Toland² tells us in one place that it was called the secret of writing; and that by Ogum were meant the primitive Irish characters or letters, which were of a quite different form from those that St. Patrick afterwards introduced; and that they were afterwards, instead of the secret of writing, called the secret writing only by accident; because St. Patrick having brought in the Roman letters, the Ogum began to grow obsolete, and was only intelligible to the learned, and became by degrees unintelligible to all others. This is indeed a very ingenious evasion, and answers to the objection that is drawn from the account that Waræus gives of the Ogum.

But this conduct of St. Patrick would have been such a singularity as we meet with nowhere else; that any apostolical preacher sent to convert a nation to Christianity, and finding the use of letters among them, instead of making use of that as a means by which the gospel and doctrine of the Christian religion might be more quickly and more easily propagated, should begin by introducing among them a new form of characters or letters entirely unknown to them, and which would take them more time and more pains to learn than all the necessary doctrines of Christianity. And is it very credible that St. Patrick would willingly put this new and useless obstacle to the speedy propagation of the gospel that he came to preach, and not rather make use of the advantage that the Irish, having already the use of letters among them, presented to him to advance his apostolical work? And this so much the more that St. Patrick,³ having spent about seven years of his youth in Ireland, had perfectly learned their language, and if they had the use of letters, might have learned that too.

But the same Toland,⁴ in another place, gives us a quite

¹ Waræus, de Antiq. Hybern. c. 2, p. 12.

² Toland's Posthum. Works, p. 36.

³ Usher, Antiq. Brit. Eccles. fol. p. 431.

⁴ Toland, Posthum. Works, p. 38.

different notion of the Ogum; for he brings in William Odonell, afterwards a bishop, telling King James I. that he had enjoined one of his assistants, in translating the Bible into Irish, to write it according to the Ogum, and the propriety of the Irish tongue. Now I ask here, Was this Ogum that ancient Irish alphabet, or the Beth-luis-nion, which Toland had informed us above was become intelligible only to the learned? But that had been to render the Scriptures absolutely unintelligible and useless, not only to lay people, but to ministers. So, to be sure, the bishop would not make such a shocking proposal to the king. By the Ogum, then, in this place, must be meant only the propriety of the Irish language, and so Toland himself explains it, or the true orthography of it, and that in the usual Irish characters or letters. And, by consequence, no proof can be drawn from the Ogum of any peculiar characters or letters among the Irish different from what we meet with in their MSS. and books printed in Irish character, which, as hath been already observed, was introduced by St. Patrick, and derived from the Latin.

Now whether this character, which resembles perfectly to the Saxon, came immediately from the Irish to the Saxons, or from the ancient Britains to both, as the author of the *History of Great Britain*, lately published, or rather Mr. Edward Lhuyd,¹ in his Welsh preface to his *Archæologia*, translated and inserted into the introduction to this history, pretends, I shall determine nothing, though I think Mr. Lhuyd's opinion better grounded and more probable; but whoever brought these letters or characters first into Britain or Ireland, we have elsewhere² abundantly shown that they came originally from the Romans.

But for a further proof of the ancient use of letters in Ireland before St. Patrick's time, Toland tells us³ that 'there flourished a great number of Druids, bards, vaids, and other authors in Ireland long before Patrick's arrival, whose learning,' says he (though he knew that they were all infidels), 'was not only more extensive, but also more useful than that of their Christian posterity; this last sort being almost wholly employed in scholastic divinity, metaphysical or chronological disputes,' etc.

Now Toland knew also very well that, notwithstanding any alteration that might have happened among the Irish in the method or order of teaching the Christian religion, the substance and essentials of it were still the same after the

¹ Hist. of Great Britain, in folio, by John Lewis. Introduction, pp. 59, 60, etc.

² *Supra*, p. 247, etc.

³ Toland, *ibid.* p. 48.

eighth age as before ; and was, then, the learning of the Druids, who were truly magicians, more useful, in Toland's judgment, than that of Christianity ? and do all the pretensions of this famous free-thinker, to be governed in his belief solely by reason, terminate at last in such impious notions ? I call the Druids magicians, because *drúai*, or *dróiche*, which is the Irish name of Druids, is the same by which, in the Irish translation of the Bible, both in the Old and New Testaments, a magician is expressed ; and that in the Latin lives of St. Patrick, and in that of St. Columba, by Adamnan, the Druids are called Magi.

Toland, for new proofs of the ancient use of letters in Ireland, runs¹ out into a long digression upon the singular care and encouragement of learning in that island before St. Patrick's time, as Keating, O'Flaherty, and others had done before him ; each of them, as Toland² himself expresses elsewhere this copying one from another, eternally serving up the same dishes at every meal, and all of them referring to the authority of their ancient monuments written by their bards, but never publishing any single entire piece of them, equally leave all of them in doubt. Toland goes on and tells us that there are great numbers³ of MSS. of the Druids' compositions still remaining ; and for a certain proof of there having been such books of the Druids extant before St. Patrick's time, he quotes some modern Irish writers, who, from some of the many legends of St. Patrick's life, relate that he caused to be burned many volumes of the Druids, stuffed with fables and heathen superstitions. At which Toland⁴ enters into a vehement declamation against this 'book-burning and letter-murdering humour, which,' says he, 'though far from being commanded by Christ, has prevailed in Christianity from the beginning ; as in the Acts of the Apostles⁵ we read, "that many of them which believed, and used curious arts, brought their books together, and burnt them before all men : and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver," or about three hundred pounds sterling. This was the first instance of burning of books among Christians ; and ever since that time the example has been better followed than any precept of the gospel.' Thus Toland. And one that did not know the fate of his *Christianity not Mysterious* would easily suspect, by the passion with which he makes mention of the apostles burning wicked books, that he is himself a party concerned.

But whatever be of the legends of St. Patrick, which even Toland can believe when they serve to his purpose, it may

¹ Toland, ibid. pp. 49, 50, etc.

⁴ Ibid. p. 58.

² Ibid.

⁵ Acts xix. 19.

³ Ibid. p. 45.

very well have happened that the Druids, being magicians, made use of magical or other hieroglyphic characters, intelligible only to themselves and their confederates, to express their diabolical enchantments and superstitions; and that they had volumes full of these, which, after the example of the apostles, inflamed St. Patrick's zeal against them. But all this is no proof that they had the use of alphabetical letters, or that it was common in Ireland before St. Patrick taught it to the natives.

ART. V.—*That even supposing that the Irish had the use of Letters before the Gospel was preached among them, their pretended Ancient Writers, the Bards, deserve no credit.*

The description that Cornelius Tacitus gives us of the custom used among the Germans, living in their natural state, towards preserving the memory of things past in old times, seems a lively portraiture of the more common means in use among the rest of the uncultivated northern nations towards compassing the same end. He tells us that the Germans of old had no use¹ of letters among them; and that the only means² they had for preserving the memory of past transactions, and their only annals, were rhymes got by heart, which contained the elogiums of their first founders, and of those they looked upon as their heroes; and, a little after, he tells us that they had rhymes or verses on this subject, called by them Barditus, by which they used to animate their soldiers to fight. Now this Barditus seems visibly derived from the bards, authors of those kind of rhymes. And thus it was, in all probability, among the rest of the northern uncultivated nations. The only records of past transactions were the rhymes of the bards, not put in writing, but got by heart, and recited on solemn occasions. The Irish in particular agree that the bards, to whom they give several names, were the recorders and preservers of their ancient transactions. It is therefore of importance to inquire into the character of the bards in general, and of those of Ireland in particular, in order to judge of the credit of their high antiquities.

SEC. I.—*Of the Bards in general.*

In the first place, it is to be remarked that the bards,

¹ ‘Literarum secreta tam viri quam mulieres ignorant.’—*Tacit. de Morib. German.* p. 224, edit. Plantin. fol. A.D. 1585.

² ‘Celebrant carminibus antiquis (quod unicum apud illos memoriae & annalium genus est) Tuistonem Deum terra editum & filium Mannum, originem gentis conditoresque.—Sunt illis haec quoque carmina, quorum relatu, quem Barditum vocant, accendunt animos.’—*Tacit. ibid.* p. 221.

seanachies, or antiquaries, poets, and genealogists, frequently mentioned by the Irish writers, are but different names that design one and the same kind of men, called in Celtic (and from thence by the Greeks and Latins, and in other languages) bards, or, which is the same thing, poets, because they used to compose and chant verses or rhymes in praise of their heroes or benefactors; called likewise antiquaries in Irish seanachies, by reason that the subject of their rhymes was ordinarily the feats of ancient heroes, and of the ancestors of their patrons or benefactors; called genealogists, because in some countries a part of their office was to make up and retain genealogies for their great men, or those that came to be in power.

As to the name of bard, it is originally Celtic, and so common to the Britains and Irish, as well as to the ancient Gauls, all these languages being originally dialects of the Celtic; and the word bard, in the Celtic tongue, signifies a poet, as a learned antiquary observes.¹ So we may observe, among the northern nations, the Swedes and Danes, any knowledge they pretend to of their antiquities is ascribed by them to their ancient poets, the same kind of men as the Celtic bards; and they pretend, no less than the Irish, to have remains and fragments of poems and rhymes on their ancient heroes; and by that means set up for as high antiquities as the Irish do,—witness Johannes Magnus,² archbishop of Upsal, his history of the Goths, which he begins, as the Irish do, at Magog, the son of Japhet, and brings from him a distinct history of kings, succeeding one to another, down to his own time, to wit, to the sixteenth age.

The bards are entirely to be distinguished from the Druids and from the evages, or vates of the ancients, whose character, as well as their discipline, was quite distinct, as they are set down by Cæsar³ of the Druids, and more particularly by Ammian Marcellin⁴ both of the Druids and evages; neither of which had anything to do with recording past transactions or histories, their whole office being employed about the religious part of the heathenish superstitions, or the forming their laws and manners, and deciding controversies or debates. But none of the many ancient authors that treat of Druids ever give them, for any part of their calling, the writing or keeping records of history; and Ammian distinguishes them entirely from the bards.

As to the character of the bards among the ancients, Possi-

¹ Pezron, *Antiquité des Gaules*, p. 378.

² Johan. Magnus, *Historia Goth.* edit. Basil. 1558.

³ Cæsar, *de Bello Gallico*, lib. 6, p. 164, ed. Elzevir, 1661.

⁴ ‘Euhages scrutantes seria & sublimia natura pandere conabantur. Inter hos Druidæ ingenii celsiores,’ etc.—Ammian. lib. 15, p. 51, ed. Vales. in 4to.

donius (one of the most ancient authors that mention them), quoted by Athenæus, reckons them among the parasites that lived by their flattering great or rich men. Diodorus¹ gives much the same account of them; and Appian speaks of them much in the same sense. Upon these and other passages of the ancients, the learned Valesius,² in his notes upon Ammian Marcellin, gives us the following description of them. By this, says Valesius, it appears the bards were nothing else but parasites, and such a kind of men as the Latins call *scurræ* or buffoons; for as these buffoons or *scurræ* used to follow the armies to divert the soldiers in their banquets by their jests and mimical gestures, so likewise the bards used to do. But this character seems too hard, if literally pressed; for it appears by Ammian, in the place upon which Valesius comments here, that the bards had beside this, at least among the Gauls, another more honourable means to flatter great men, by composing poems on the noble feats of the heroes, and singing them to their harps.³

We are, then, now to consider how far the knowledge of history, or of the antiquities of any nation, might have been preserved by men of the character of the bards. And, in the first place, it may be allowed that some confused memory of the first founders and more famous heroes of a nation might have been preserved by their means; this may be confirmed by what we have already observed from Tacitus of the custom of the ancient Germans; but it must be also allowed that the accounts which the bards or poets of the ancients brought down of the origins of nations and founders of empires were so absolutely uncertain, and mixed with so many fables, that they can make no more faith in true history than Virgil's *Aeneid* can serve to give us light into the origin of the Latins or Romans.

In the second place, some drafts of genealogies for princes or great men might also probably have been the fabric of the bards, since that is made a part of their office; and nobody fitter for it than such as they, who stood at nothing to flatter their patrons, and gain favour with all that came to be in power, who could not fail to have their pedigree traced back to the first founders or most famous men of a nation, since it cost no more than the coining a few names, or mixing them with some already in use. And these genealogies became a

¹ Diod. Sicul. lib. 5.

² 'Ex his patet bardos nihil aliud fuisse quam parasitos, planeque similes eorum quos Latini scurras vocabant: ut enim scurræ exercitum sequebantur, jocis ac gesticulationibus milites inter convivia delinire soliti, ita etiam bardi.' — *Vales. not. in Ammian.* p. 93.

³ 'Et bardi quidem fortia virorum illustrium facta heroicis composita versibus cum dulcibus lyra modulis cantitarunt.' — *Ammian.* lib. 15, p. 51.

foundation upon which to build new heroes and noble exploits in after times, when all distinct memory of past transactions being extinct, there was none who could contradict them, or who would dare to do it, when those whose ancestors were erected into heroes were powerful enough to crush all gain-sayers. Thus the bards might have coined the first genealogies, and afterwards either they themselves, or others of the same stamp, created some of them heroes and conquerors, and attributed great exploits to them, according as it might serve to the honour of those in power at the time, whom the bards had made to descend from them; these rude drafts were polished by others, and epochs and dates added to them by posterior bards.

But all these rare collections of antiquities, so much valued in dark ages, came afterwards in other countries to be neglected and brought into contempt, especially in these later times, when the study of critic and true ancient history being renewed and generally received, the impartial men among the learned, in none of the northern countries of Europe, whether Germans, French, Spaniards, Danes, etc., do pretend to any certain history, or accounts of the origin of their people, or antiquities of their countries, but what they collect and, as it were, glean from the Greek and Roman writers; nothing from their domestic writers in prose or in rhyme in their native tongues before the times of the Roman empire. And what the ignorance or credulity of dark past ages had received of that kind, or that forgers had invented, though in praise of their ancestors, hath in this clear-sighted age been rejected, even by those most concerned, with disdain and contempt. Thus the French have rejected Hunibaldus; the Spaniards, Berosus; the learned among the English, Geoffrey's inventions; and so of most other polite nations.

Thus we see how little credit hath been given of late generally, in all countries where learning hath been improved, to rhymes or rhapsodies of bards or other forgers, since nothing of that kind, or very little, hath been thought fit to be transmitted to posterity or published to the world.

SEC. II.—*Of the Irish Bards.*

But perhaps the bards or seanachies of Ireland were a kind of men of greater credit and veracity, and less subject to flattering, lying, or detraction, and not so liable as the bards in other nations to the several passions that make men swerve from the truth, that so their accounts of antiquity might deserve to be more valued.

But we need no other proofs than those we are furnished with by the Irish writers, and those, too, the greatest admirers of their high antiquities, to prove that the Irish bards or antiquaries were of all others the least to be depended on.

Odonnell, an Irish writer of the life of St. Columba, translated into Latin, and published by Colgan¹ in his *Trias Thaumaturga*, informs us that about the year 586 of Christ, it was decreed in the assembly of Dromkeat, by Aidus king of Ireland, that all the race of the bards or antiquaries should be banished that kingdom, and their discipline abolished; but that St. Columba (a very likely tale) was pleased to intercede for them. And the motive of this decree or law against the bards or antiquaries is very remarkable, to wit, because they² used to turn their rhymes or poems (in which they delivered the accounts of antiquities or genealogies) into excessive praises and flatteries of the great men whose favour or presents they hunted after, or in satirical invectives against those that were not so liberal to them. This is just the character that Diodorus Siculus had given of the bards among the Celts:³ ‘Sunt apud eos (Celtas) melici poetæ quos appellant bardos. Hi ad instrumenta quedam lyris similia horum laudes, illorum vituperia decantant.’ This justifies Valesius⁴ character of the bards, that their custom was to praise and flatter their masters and princes, and those who bestowed most upon them, and to make bitter invectives against the enemies and adversaries of their patrons, and those that were not liberal to them; so it appears that both the Celtic and Irish bards were equally a kind of parasites in effect, but with this difference, that these ancient bards of the Celts got perhaps nothing but to fill their bellies in reward for their flatteries; whereas we are told⁵ that the Irish bards or antiquaries got for their reward lands and possessions.

Now let it be remarked, that these bards or antiquaries whom Odonnell says were decreed to be banished the kingdom for their impostures, flatteries, and calumnies, were probably Christians; since St. Columba is brought in to intercede for them, and that Christianity had been by this time settled in Ireland for above one hundred years. What, then, may be

¹ ‘Rex Aidus statuerat bardos, seu antiquariae rei professores tota insula pellere & disciplinam abolere.’—*Colgan, Triad Thaumaturga*, pp. 430, 431.

² ‘Sua saepe poemata convertebant in excessivas laudes horum nobilium quorum gratiam & donaria venabantur, saepe in satyricas invectivas in alios quibus æque affecti aut beneficiis allecti non erant.’—*Colgan, ibid.*

³ *Diodor. lib. 5, p. 425.*

⁴ ‘Quippe dominos suos & reges quorum mensas sectabantur bardi laudabant: imicos vero hostesque regum suorum conviciis incesebant.’—*Vales. not. in Ammian. p. 93.*

⁵ *D. Ken. Geneal. Praef. p. 78.*

thought of the ancient bards or antiquaries of Ireland in times of paganism? And how far would their writings, if they had left any, deserve to be depended on, when they left the spirit of imposture so deeply rooted in their posterity, that even Christianity could not correct it? What certain history might we expect from them, if anything had remained of their rhymes to after ages?

But this is not all; we are told further¹. that the bards or antiquaries of Ireland had been twice decreed before this to be expelled out of the island, their impostures, flatteries, and insolence having frequently grown to that height that even pagans had a horror of, and could not bear with them. And M. Toland,² as hath been already observed, acknowledges that the Irish bards, ‘besides their poetical licences, were both mercenary and partial to a scandalous degree.’

Nothing shows a plainer proof to what a pitch those pretended antiquaries of Ireland had carried their impostures and fabulous flatteries, than to consider what the Irish³ writers often repeat, of the great love and attachment their countrymen had to the bards and antiquaries, when they kept within tolerable bounds. To what a pitch, then, of lying and calumny must they have arrived, when the Irish, notwithstanding the love we are told they had for preserving the memory of their antiquities, found themselves obliged to come thrice, at different times, to a resolution of banishing these only recorders and preservers of them!

By this, I conceive, it plainly appears that the Irish bards were at least of no greater credit than those of other nations; no less accustomed to measure their rhymes and historical accounts only by love, hatred, interest, and such other passions that make men swerve from the truth, and render their testimony unworthy of credit; so that in case anything were remaining of the rhymes of the bards, especially antecedent to the times in which they received Christianity and the use of letters, it may be expected that the generality of the more considerate men of the nation will by degrees look upon these remains of the bards as unworthy of taking place in the body of their history, as we see the more learned and judicious among them do already contemn them, as the Germans, Spaniards, the French, and other nations have done,—among whom no men of learning pretend to have any remains of their ancient bards, or any writers before the fifth or sixth age, nor any certainty of their origins, nor of the ancient historical accounts of

¹ D. Ken. Geneal. Praef. pp. 77, 170; Keating, p. 371, *et alibi*.

² Toland's Posthumous Works, tom. i. p. 50.

³ Keating, Flaherty, etc.; D. Ken. Geneal. Praef. *passim*.

their countries, but what they pick out of the Greek and Latin authors.

And so I think it may be concluded, with the learned Waræus,¹ that all these pretended ancient rhymes, in which we are told are contained accounts of the first founders, colonies, genealogies, and ancient kings of Ireland, are not pieces conveyed down from the times before Christianity was received, as their modern writers would have us believe, but are almost all of them the productions of later ages.

And from all that hath been said in this paragraph of the bards, we may likewise conclude, that though we should suppose (against what hath been shown before²) that the use of letters had been received in Ireland in ancient times, before the preaching of the gospel there, yet the only pretended writers of the Irish in these early times being the bards, no credit ought to be given to the accounts of men of such an odious character.

ART. VI.—The Uncertainty of the remote Antiquities of Ireland appears by the contradictory Accounts giren of them, and the many Alterations made in them by posterior Writers.

That very little credit ought to be given to the Irish bards in the accounts of their remote antiquities, even suppose it were granted that the use of letters had been in Ireland before Christianity, will as yet appear more evident to any that will consider, in the first place, the contradictions betwixt the ancient and modern writers in the accounts they give of those antiquities; and, in the next, the many additions, retrenchments, and alterations or reformations made by degrees in the first rude drafts of them, left by those bards who first invented them,—made in them, I say, afterwards by their posterior bards or antiquaries, as they came more and more to the knowledge of the general history of the world.

Who is there among the learned antiquaries of this critical age that can believe, for example, the detail of the accounts which we have set down from the modern Irish writers,—Art. I. Of the plantations of Ireland, even since the flood of Noah, and before the Milesians; and Art. II. Those of the ancient literature of the Irish before the times of Christianity,—especially if compared with the accounts that the most ancient writers, and the most learned among the modern, give unani-

¹ ‘Notandum descriptiones fere omnium [rerum in Hybernia gestarum] quæ de illis temporibus (vestustioribus dico) extant, opera esse posteriorum sæculorum.’ — *War. de Antiq. Hybern.* Praef. p. 1.

² Secs. 3, 4.

mously, as we have seen, of their being uncultivated, and in the ignorance of letters common to all other northern nations of Europe in those early times? And yet all these accounts of their ancient plantations, with a greater detail of circumstances than I have related, as well as those of the school in the plains of Senaar, and other instances of their ancient literature, are related, as they inform us, by their bards or seanachies, and other writers whom they value most.

But to go no farther up than the coming in of the Milesians, on the certainty of which all their following history and succession of their ancient kings till the times of Christianity do depend, what is more capable to bring in doubt all the detail they give of the Milesians, than to pretend to give us, as they do, the precise day of the week, of the month, and of the moon, on which the Milesians first landed in Ireland; when at the same time we have assured proofs that only three or four ages ago they knew not within several hundred years the precise era of the coming in of that colony? O'Flaherty,¹ one of their most learned writers, places the settlement of the Milesians in Ireland only one thousand years before the incarnation; others, as Keating and Dr. Kenedy, say one thousand three hundred years; others, one thousand four hundred; but Donald Oneyl, a king of Ulster, with the other princes and inhabitants of Ireland, in their letter² to Pope John XXII. A.D. 1317, informs the pope (no doubt, according to the common opinions of the most learned bards or antiquaries of their time) that it was above three thousand five hundred years since the three sons of Milesius came from Spain and settled in Ireland; that is to say, that in the opinion of the antiquaries of these times, the Milesian colony settled in Ireland about two thousand two hundred years before the incarnation. So, whilst their writers pretend to give us the precise day of the week, and of the moon, of this colony's coming to Ireland, there is above one thousand years' difference betwixt the date that the Irish antiquaries give to it in the fourteenth age, and that to which Flaherty hath reduced it in the seventeenth. And the same letter contains another proof of the inconsistencies of these Milesian antiquities, in the number of Irish kings of that race, which the modern Irish reckon only 126 or 127, from Heremon

¹ Ogyg. pp. 83, 84, etc., 182, 183, etc.

² ‘A tempore quo antiqui patres nostri, scilicet tres filii Milesii Hispani cum triginta navium classe in Cantabria—in Hiberniam, tunc omni carentem incola, divinitus devenerant, tres mille quingenti & amplius fluxerunt anni; & ex ipsis, sine admixtione sanguinis alieni, totius Hybernie cœperunt monarchiam reges centum triginta sex usque Legarium regem. Ex literis Donaldi Oneyl regis Ultoniæ,’ etc.—*Ad Joannem P. XXII. apud Fordun, edit. Tho. Hearne, p. 908.*

to Leogaire ; whereas King Donald Oneyl's seanachies reckoned them 136. And it is not unlikely, that if they would at last gratify the public with a true edition of the ancientest poems or works of their bards on this subject, we should find that the older they are, the more they would be incredible in themselves, and the more inconsistent with the new schemes to which they have reduced them.

But, in the meantime, until exact copies be published, with literal translations, and without alterations of these ancient poems or works of their bards or seanachies, and among the rest, the book with the white cover,¹ a very authentic piece, written, as they say, in their pagan ancestors' time ; the book of conquests ;² the *Psaltar Cusel*, and such others, which they assure us are still in being,³ and in their possession, containing their remote antiquities before Christianity,—in the meantime, till these be published, some of their many variations and alterations in the scheme of their antiquities, and the inconsistency of their modern schemes of them, with the first drafts of them broached by their bards in times of ignorance, may be shown by setting down the different and contradictory accounts which the Irish and Scots give of them, though originally the same.

And, first, it is to be observed that the Irish writers will by no means allow the Scots any knowledge of these high antiquities but what they received at first from the Irish. ‘The Scots,’ says a late writer,⁴ ‘have no history or records (of the high antiquities) but what they copied or transcribed from those of Ireland.’ I am truly of the same opinion as to all that is related of the Scots before they came over to Britain, and whilst they made as yet one people with the inhabitants of Ireland ; and it were a great injustice to rob the Irish seanachies of the honour of being the first inventors and abettors of these high antiquities.

This supposed, it follows in course that the stories of the Irish and Scottish seanachies concerning the origin, genealogy, and various transmigrations of the Channagaodhall or Milesian race, were originally the same, as proceeding from the same source, to wit, the Irish bards or seanachies. Now it is certain that the accounts which the Irish and Scots give of these antiquities are become in progress of time very different, both as to the genealogy, the time of their first settlement in Ireland, the founders, and beginning of their monarchy there ; and, by consequence, either the Irish or the Scotish antiquaries must have made considerable alterations in them since the times that the Scots at first received them from the Irish. And it

¹ Leabhar Dromasnachta.
³ D. Ken. Praef. p. 25.

² Leabhar Gabhala.
⁴ Ibid. pp. 6, 7.

seems no less certain that those alterations can be ascribed only to those that had interest to make them, towards raising their credit, and procuring honour to themselves by them.

In the next place, it doth not appear that the Scots in Britain had any private interest or national concern in transactions which are supposed to have passed long before they came to be settled in Britain as a distinct people from the Irish, and therefore would naturally leave the genealogies, names of founders, and epochs of their coming to Ireland in the same case as they had at first received them from the Irish bards, without any alteration by design.

Whereas, on the contrary, the Irish writers had private motives, and a national concern, as we shall just now see, for the honour of their country, to alter them; since, in order to render their history and genealogies the more likely, and to raise their settlement in Ireland, and beginning of their monarchy in the Milesian line, to a greater height of antiquity, they were under a necessity of reforming and polishing the first rude drafts of their antiquities, which their bards or seanachies had broached in times of darkness and ignorance, without a prospect of the large fabric which their posterity, by the help of a further insight in the general history of the world, were to raise upon these rude and imperfect beginnings.

We shall now compare together the different accounts given of those antiquities by the most ancient Scotish writers remaining, and those given of them by the Irish of the present and these several ages past. By the first, we shall see the first originals of these antiquities in the condition in which the Scots at first received them from the Irish. By the latter, that is, by the present scheme to which the Irish have reduced those antiquities, we shall easily observe (in comparing it to the scheme which the Scots at first received and have preserved) what alterations the Irish seanachies and critics have thought fit, in after ages, to make in them; and, at the same time, we shall endeavour to discover the motives of some of the more remarkable of these alterations.

1st. Both the Scotish and Irish antiquaries bring down the genealogies from Noah's son Japhet;¹ but the first inventors of the genealogy bring the descent by Gomer, as being Japhet's eldest son; and so it is set down by Magraith,² one of the most famous Irish genealogists, and the Scots have still retained it. Whereas the posterior Irish writers, having become acquainted with ancient history, and finding that the Scythians, of whom the Scots are thought to be descended, came from

¹ Fordun, lib. 5, c. 50, edit. Th. Hearne, pp. 487, 488.

² Codex ms. Biblioth. Ducis de Chandois, vol. lxxviii.

Magog, according to Josephus and other historians, and not from Gomer, reformed the old genealogy, and brought the descent from Magog. It is easy to see that this alteration is the effect of reflection and second thoughts.

2d. It appears that in the first drafts of this genealogy there were one hundred and four descents from Adam¹—that is, ninety-four from Noah, till Conarc-mor, whom the Irish place about the time of the incarnation; and the Scots, in their drafts of it, retain still the same number of generations or descents. But it is easy to see that the Irish antiquaries, having afterwards perused the Holy Scriptures, and observing that in the same space of time and number of years there were only sixty-seven generations from Noah till Christ set down by St. Luke, and according to St. Matthew only fifty or fifty-four, thought fit to reform the old draft of their genealogy, containing about ninety-four generations in the same length of time, and by cutting off twenty of them, reduced them first to about seventy-two generations; and, not satisfied with that, Flaherty² lops off nine or ten more, and reduces them exactly to the number of the longest Scripture genealogy, that of St. Luke. And so, on the whole, there are about thirty generations cut off, and the number, which was one hundred and four (from Adam to Conar, placed in the time of the incarnation, according to the old drafts of the genealogy still preserved by the Scots), is reduced to about seventy-five or seventy-six. And among these lopped off by Flaherty, are Fergus, Maine, and others, reckoned among the first Scotish kings in their vulgar histories.

This freedom that Flaherty takes with the genealogy shows us what was the custom of their bards in former ages to reform their antiquities, to render them more conformable to other received histories; and that the difference betwixt the numbers of descents in this genealogy in the Scotish and Irish accounts of it proceeds, in all appearance, from the former reductions the Irish had made of it, in order to render it more likely, and so gain credit to their antiquities, whereof this genealogy is the chief foundation. Whereas the Scots, having no such interest in the remote antiquities of Ireland, preserved with simplicity the genealogy in the same state that they had first received it from the Irish bards before these alterations. And for a further proof that the Scots' account of it is the more ancient and genuine, and was in ancient times that of the Irish also, we find the same names and number of descents in the most ancient copies of it, whereof one will be found in the appendix of pieces, No. 4, by an author of the twelfth age, ending at

¹ Fordun, *supra*.

² Ogyg. p. 122.

King Williaun; the other is in Radulfus de Diceto,¹ dean of London, in the same age.

3d. It appears also that the Scots² preserved with the same simplicity the stories of Gathelus or Gaidelglas, and of Milesius, whom they call Micelius and Miledespain, in the native shape in which they had been first conceived by the Irish bards, and delivered to the Scots before they were refined. That Gathelus, son of Niulus, having fled to Egypt, married Scota, Pharaoh's daughter, and that in Moses' time. That on occasion of the plagues sent on Egypt, Gathelus left it, with his wife Scota and followers, and after a long pilgrimage arrived in Spain, and there settled a kingdom of Scots, so called from this Scota; and from him descended Micelius or Milesius, in the thirteenth degree, his successor in the kingdom of Scots in Spain. This Gathelus, before he died, sent the first colony to Ireland, under his son Hyber, and from him the island took its name.

This was the story of Gathelus or Gaidelglas and Scota, such as we find it not only in Boece, but in Fordun.

Now it is to be observed (as we are informed by one of Fordun's³ continuators, who gives us an account of his travels in order to collect materials for his chronicles) that Fordun, besides his consulting the Scottish seanachies upon the antiquities of the Scots in the earliest times, went over on purpose to Ireland to consult also the seanachies or antiquaries of that island, looked upon as oracles⁴ in those matters. And it is remarked in particular by that writer, that Fordun not only conversed with the historians of all parts where he travelled, but inspected their annals, and conferred with them upon history and antiquities. This was in the fourteenth age, not long after the letter already mentioned of King Donald Oneyl to Pope John XXII., in which that prince gives, from the seanachies of those times, so different an account, both of the antiquity of the Milesian settlement and of the number of kings of that race, from what the modern Irish writers relate of the one and the other. Now Fordun, having compared the Scottish accounts of these remote antiquities with those of the seanachies of Ireland, must have found them, in all appearance, conformable to some of the Irish accounts (for by what we have observed from King Donald's letter, they were not all of a piece). This renders Fordun's authority more considerable in those remote antiquities, which, as it will appear in the sequel of this essay, was one of the chief objects of Fordun's travels, in order to raise the Scottish antiquities as high as King Edward I., in his letter to Pope Boniface VIII., had raised those of the Britains.

¹ Decem Scriptor. Angl. col. 627.

³ Supra, p. 125, ex Praef. Chron. de Cupro.

² Fordun, lib. 1, cc. 10, 11, etc.

⁴ 'In oraculis Hyberniae,' ibid.

But to return to the story of Gathelus or Gaidelglas. That the account that Fordun gives of that story was conformable to what the Scots at first had received from the Irish seanachies, appears for the reason already alleged, to wit, that the Scots having become a distinct nation from the Irish, had no interest to rectify the errors of those antiquities, and therefore preserved the accounts of them, without examining whether likely or not, but contented themselves to hand them down to posterity such as they found them. But the seanachies of Ireland becoming more learned in after ages, and discovering the palpable inconsistency of these first drafts of their antiquities with the Holy Scripture and all true history, thought with reason that they had as good a right to correct and reform them as the old bards their predecessors had at first to invent them. Having, then, observed that there was no possibility of making Moses and Gaidelglas contemporary, Moses being in the seventeenth degree descended from Noah, and Gaidel (according to the alteration made in the genealogy) only in the seventh degree, and there being (as Flaherty observes) about six hundred years betwixt Gaidel and Moses, they were forced to abandon the epoch of Moses' time ; but being, it seems, unwilling to lose this Scota, daughter of Pharaoh, and her marriage with Niul or Gaidel, which their own ancient bards, as well as those of the Scots, had maintained, they resolved to have a new Scota, daughter also to another Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to be married to one of their leading men, and give her name to the nation.

None was so fit for this match as Milesius, whom they intended to make the patriarch of the Milesian colony in Ireland, and stock of a long race of kings in that island. But Milesius was king of the Scots in Spain, where, according to the old form of the genealogy, his predecessors had reigned for about thirteen generations, down from the times of Gaidelglas. He is therefore conveyed away back from Spain, first to Scythia, where he is made to serve under King Refloir, and thence to Egypt, where he married the second Scota, daughter to another Pharaoh, and carried her with him to Spain.

4th. According to the Scotish tradition,¹ this Milesius sent indeed to Ireland a second colony from Spain, with his sons Heremon, Partholom or Bartholom, and Hybert; these two last, it seems, remained in Ireland. But as for Heremon, he returned back to Spain, and succeeded his father Milesius in the kingdom of Scots in Spain, where his posterity continued down the race of Scotish kings for twenty generations, till the time of one Eondulf, son of Edanglas or Etheon. This Eondulf or Fondulf sent a third colony to Ireland, under the command

¹ Fordun, lib. 1, c. 21.

of his son Simon Breac,¹ who carried with him the famous fatal stone, and placed it as the seat of the kingdom at Themor or Teambra, and thus founded the monarchy of the Scots in Ireland about the time of Manasses, king of Judah, that is, about six hundred years before the birth of Christ. From this Simon Breac, say the Scots, are descended all the monarchs of Ireland, and in after ages those of Scotland. And this was the account of the beginning of the Irish monarchy, as the Scots had it from them, in ancient times; and so, in all appearance, it was the first draft of it invented by the bards.

But the succeeding Irish antiquaries were, it seems, by no means satisfied with this first plan of the Milesian Scotish monarchy in Ireland, which placed their settlement and beginning of their monarchy no sooner than about six hundred years before the incarnation; and being resolved to give it a much higher date, they pitched, for the founder of it, on Heremon, son to Milesius, about twenty generations before Simon Breac. And therefore, whereas the Scottish antiquaries had told us that Heremon, after visiting Ireland, had immediately returned back and succeeded Milesius his father as king of the Scots in Spain, and there his posterity reigned after him down till Simon Breac, the posterior seanachies of Ireland would not have Heremon to return to Spain, but to remain in Ireland, and there set up the Irish monarchy, some say two thousand years before the incarnation, others thirteen hundred. And Flaherty at last hath criticised away about one-half of the time, and settled the epoch of the foundation of the Milesian kings in Ireland by Heremon about a thousand years only before the birth of Christ.

And as for Simon Breac, whom the Scots, on the credit of, or tradition of, the Irish bards (their only vouchers for all these high antiquities), had brought from Spain, with the fatal chair, to become the first founder of that monarchy, the later Irish seanachies will have him never to have been in Spain, nor out of Ireland, and appoint him the thirty-eighth king of the Milesian Scots in Ireland from Heremon; and at last, perhaps to hinder any ever after to give him the honourable title of first founder of that monarchy, the succeeding antiquaries of Ireland,² by that sovereign power they have, as well as their predecessors, to make and unmake monarchs, and dispose in their rhymes as well of their fortunes as of their beings, have doomed Simon, as the fancy took them, some of them, to be hanged on a gibbet; others, to be torn to pieces.

I am afraid that those among the Irish who still set up for these remote antiquities will be dissatisfied with the placing on

¹ Fordun, lib. 1, c. 26.

² Ogyg. p. 249; Keating.

a level the Scotish traditions concerning these antiquities with those of the Irish ; for what is John Fordun, a private churchman, who wrote only in the fourteenth age, when compared to Cormac Culenan, a king and bishop, author of the *Psaltar Cashel*, who wrote in the tenth age ?

But, in the first place, John Fordun, as hath been elsewhere observed, hath this advantage over the *Psaltar Cashel*, that his chronicle is in print, and the public in condition to examine and judge of it ; whereas *Psaltar Cashel* is kept still in the dark, with the rest of the Irish seanachies' works, so that hitherto no judgment can be made of it. 2d. It is to be considered that neither the *Psaltar Cashel* nor John Fordun can be alleged as records sufficient to vouch or attest transactions passed about two thousand years before their times, such as the stories of Milesius, Heremon, and Simon Breac ; but the authority, both of the one and the other, can be valued only in so far as it is supposed that they copied from more ancient writers. Now, if *Psaltar Cashel* quotes, as we are told, the book with the white cover, that of the immigrations and some Irish poems, for its authorities, John Fordun quotes for his *Chronica et alia Chronica, Grossum Caput, Legenda Brandani, Legenda Congalli*, etc. ; and why may not these last be of as great authority as the first ?

5th. The main question here is of the stories of Heremon, son to Milesius, and of Simon Breac, which of the two was the founder of the Milesian monarchy in Ireland ?

It is, in the first place, agreed on both sides that the Scots in Britain had originally their accounts of these high antiquities from the Irish ; now if, at the time when they first received these stories from the Irish, it had been the common tradition of the bards that Heremon remained in Ireland, and was the first founder of the monarchy, there can no reasonable motive be assigned why the Scots, having that tradition from the ancient Irish, should have altered it, and held so positively that Heremon returned back to Spain, and there succeeded his father Milesius ; and that the Scotish monarchy in Ireland did not begin till about seven hundred years after Heremon ; that Simon Breac, son of Eondulf, king of the Scots in Spain, came to Ireland, and began the monarchy there. Whereas it is evident that the Irish, and they alone, had interest to alter that tradition, and set up Heremon for the first king and founder of the Milesian kingdom in Ireland, in order to attribute to their monarchy about seven hundred years of antiquity beyond what the first inventors of the story had thought of, and to create the number of thirty-nine or forty new kings of Ireland before Simon Breac, whom the Scots,

according to the accounts they had from the most ancient Irish seanachies, held for the first king of Ireland of the Milesian Irish race.

Besides that, Fordun assures us that he had this account from ancient chronicles, as I said before, whom he quotes frequently for every particular story of these high antiquities, as he does also verses or rhymes. We have a short, old chronicle¹ in Latin rhyme, written about the time of King Alexander II. or III., above one hundred years before Fordun, which gives the same account of Simon Breac's coming from Spain to Ireland with the fatal stone, or marble chair, and of his being the first founder of the Milesian Scots' monarchy in Ireland, about one thousand and two years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea in Moses' time—that is, about six hundred years only before the incarnation.

But what seems to confirm still more the Scotish account (if the more ancient writers may be depended upon), and that the Scotish tradition concerning the time of the first coming of the Milesian Scots from Spain to Ireland, in order to settle, was the ancient tradition of the Irish themselves,—what seems to prove this beyond dispute is, that Nennius, a writer of the ninth age, and by consequence more ancient than *Psaltar Cashel*, or any writer that the Irish have yet produced, tells² us in the first place, that he had his information from the most learned among the Scots, *peritissimi Scotorum* (which, if the Irish, as they use to do, interpret the most learned of the Irish, the proof will be the stronger). Nennius then tells us from these vouchers that the Scots, descended of Scota, Pharaoh's daughter, came to Ireland from Spain one thousand and two years after the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, that is, only about five or six hundred years before the incarnation; and by consequence, their monarchy in Ireland cannot be more ancient.

This, then, was the constant belief both of Scots and Irish in those days, that is, before the tenth age, when *Psaltar Cashel* is said to have been written; and this account of Nennius, agreeing entirely with the accounts given by the Scots in Britain of these high antiquities, and absolutely contrary to those of the modern Irish, shows that the Scots in Britain have carefully preserved the first drafts of these high antiquities made by the ancient bards or seanachies; and that the Irish

¹ 'Post obitum regis Pharaonis mille duobus annis ut recolo,' etc.—*Chron. Rythm. Scotor.* in Append. num. 6, c. 4.

² . . . 'Siquis voluerit scire quanto tempore fuit inhabitabilis & deserta Hybernia, sic mihi peritissimi Scotorum nuntiaverunt' . . . p. 101 . . . 'Et postea venerunt [Scoti] ad Hyberniam post mille duobus annis post misionem Ægyptiorum in Mari Iubro,' etc.—*Nennius*, edit. Rog. Gale, c. 9, p. 100.

seanachies and writers have altered them since the ninth or tenth age, in order to raise higher the beginning of the Irish monarchy, and to multiply their kings, by adding about forty ancient kings to their number.

And by this it appears that the modern Irish abettors of their high antiquities are obnoxious to the very same reproach that they make to the modern writers of Scotland, of having placed the beginning of the monarchy of the Scots in Britain about seven hundred years before the true era of that monarchy, and of having added to the number of their kings in Britain, from Fergus I. till Fergus II., forty kings that had been unknown to more ancient writers. For by what we have said, not only from the accounts of the high Irish antiquities preserved by the Scots, but from those of the best skilled among the ancient Irish in the ninth age, and by consequence more ancient than any writer the Irish have as yet published in favour of them,—from all this it appears that the Irish in later ages have set up a long race of Milesian Scotish kings in Ireland, amounting to the number of about forty, from Heremon till Simon Breac, all of them unknown to their more ancient and best skilled antiquaries, as we learn from Nennius, and pretended to have reigned above seven hundred years before the Milesian monarchy was set up in Ireland. So we may justly conclude that, however faulty or fabulous the modern Scotish writers have been in anticipating the settlement of the Scots in Britain, and multiplying the number of their kings, they did not deserve to be reproached and insulted, at least by those of the modern Irish writers, who abet with no less confidence a scheme of remote antiquities that seems no less incredible and groundless than those of the modern Scotish writers.

However, by all that hath been said in this article, it appears that the remote antiquities of Ireland were not all invented or arranged at once, but grew up, with progress of time, to the height and order that we find them digested in Flaherty, and in their other modern writers; the first bards having brought them forth in a confused and shapeless mass, such as we find them in Nennius and other ancient writers;¹ they were afterwards digested into a more regular form, with considerable alterations and additions; and, in fine, by the care and industry of more polished writers in after ages, they were brought by degrees into a more tolerable consistency, to render them credible, and cover their original deformity and palpable contradictions to all true ancient history, that would clearly

¹ See the preface to St. Cadroe's life, and that of St. Abban, in Colgan's Lives of the Saints.

appear if they were exposed to the eyes of the public in their native original dress; towards hiding of which nothing is of greater use than never to publish their pretended ancient original poems and bardish rhymes whole and entire, but to content themselves, as they have hitherto done, to refer to them in general, or to quote here and there a few passages or extracts as taken from them, but keep the entire originals still from the sight of the public, so as the reader, however skilled, can never be able to make any fixed judgment of the age or veracity of these pretended original histories or annals; but this deserves to be considered apart.

ART. VII.—*That the Irish, shunning to publish their pretended ancient original Histories or Chronicles, such as they are, without addition or retrenchment, gives a just ground to suspect the credit of them, and of the remote Antiquities built upon them.*

We are now no more in those ages of ignorance and credulity, where detailed accounts of transactions passed in the darkest and most remote antiquity, though supported only by confident assertions that they were taken from unknown ancient writers or records, went easily down. Men have begun long since to measure their belief of remote antiquities by the credit that the vouchers on which they are grounded have obtained, when, after being made public, they have passed the examination of the learned; and all trifling and shifting to expose pretended ancient writers, whole and entire, to such a trial, is much the same as to abandon them and give them up, since it visibly shows a diffidence that they cannot abide the test.

Hence a new objection against the credit of the pretended ancient writers of Ireland, and by consequence against their remote antiquities, is drawn from this, that the abettors of these high antiquities persevere to keep these pretended ancient monuments and documents of these antiquities from the eyes of the public (whilst they load it with so many other writings, pretended to be taken from them), by which they give some occasion to suspect that they are afraid that if these writings of their bards or poets, etc., were made public, whole and entire such as they are, they would be so far from finding any credit with unbiassed persons versed in ancient history, that, on the contrary, they would lose that small credit which the confident assertions of their abettors procure them, in hopes of their coming out at last to make good what they assert of them.

And, indeed, it appears a very odd thing, as we have already observed, that though there is scarce a people in Europe that

pretends to have any knowledge or light of the ancient state of their country within many ages of the times of which the Irish pretend to give us chronological, genealogical, and detailed accounts of theirs, from ancient documents or monuments of history which they assure us are still in being, yet the Irish are the only people of all the nations in Europe who have never as yet published so much as one entire copy of any one of these much boasted of old MSS. of their civil history and antiquities, written by any author that lived before these last three hundred years ; whilst at the same time they have published in this and the last age above twenty volumes of dissertations on pretended abstracts of these ancient MSS. And whilst all other nations have published all they could find of theirs, and continue daily to publish all they can discover, good or bad, of ancient monuments or documents of the history of their country, and by thus exposing those remains of their ancient history to the judgment of the learned world, and comparing them with the certain monuments of the ancient received histories of the Roman empire of their own and neighbouring nations, they come to discern the genuine pieces from the spurious, and daily correct the errors and mistakes which the ignorance and credulity of former ages had mixed with their history, and by that means gain to it credit among the learned of other nations, and to themselves the reputation of sincere lovers of truth. It is upon this principle and with this view that we have so many volumes of the English history published, under the title of *Scriptores Angliae* ; of the French, by the title of *Scriptores Francici* or *Galliae* ; the *Scriptores Germaniae*, and other northern nations ; *Scriptores Italici*, etc. And as to the Scotish history, though most of their historical ancient monuments are perished by the occasions that we shall afterwards relate, what as yet remain are published ; such as the chronicles of Mayross, two editions of that of Fordun, the short chronicle of Edinburgh. So that the Irish, being the only nation of Europe that have published none of their original ancient histories, give the public ground to suspect that they themselves distrust their authority.

But whatever there may be of those pretended ancient histories or annals of Ireland, or Irish affairs, preceding the time of King Leogaire in the fifth age, which Sir James Ware¹ tells us are ‘fabulous, or strangely mixed with fabulous narrations ;’ and therefore he thought fit, in his account of the kings of Ireland, to drop them, and begin the series of the kings of Ireland no higher than from this Leogaire ; at least, as for that part of the general history of Ireland that concerns the transactions

¹ War. Antiq. Hybern. c. 4, p. 20.

since the time of St. Patrick, as I doubt not but the writers of it may, according to their more or less antiquity, fidelity, and judiciousness, be relied on, as well as the historians of like qualifications in other countries, so I cannot help renewing here the wishes which I made in the beginning of this chapter, that they would publish their more certain chronicles and annals; it being, as it appears to me, a very great oversight in them, and may prove very hurtful to the true history of the Irish nation, that this only certain part of it is left so long in obscurity, exposed to all the accidents to which histories never yet published are liable; so that there being but a few copies, and sometimes one single copy of them, they are frequently all at once irrecoverably lost. It is a great oversight that among so many able and well qualified men that country produceth skilled in the Irish tongue, none of them hath hitherto published their original histories, with faithful translations, into Latin, that being the only sure means to preserve them to posterity, and to give credit to the citations drawn from them.

Such, among others that seem most worthy of being published, are said to be the chronicle of Tigernach, which Sir James Ware possessed, and is now in the Duke of Chandos' library, which is a very ancient ms., but seems not so entire as one that is often quoted by Flaherty, the annals of Innisfall, those of Ulster (*Ultonienses*), so often mentioned in all the Irish writers; the synchronisms of Flannus and others, giving an account of their history from St. Patrick down to the invasion of the English in the twelfth age, as they tell us. It were no doubt much for the honour and advantage of the Irish nation that these were made public, thereby to hinder them from being lost, by some such accidents as they¹ inform us so many others of their historians perished in former ages.

I have insisted so much the more upon this subject that I am persuaded nothing could contribute more to the honour of the Irish nation, in this critical age, than that some of their learned men would impartially consider these difficulties and objections, and such others as may be made against their remote antiquities, and either render public such vouchers of them as may bear the test of these times, or, according to the example of so many other countries, who had in former ages set up for such other high schemes of antiquity, drop them, and remove from their country the reproach of too great credulity; and, instead of insisting on these uncertain accounts of so remote and dark ages, publish in a body of history, as other polite nations have done, and daily continue to do, the chronicles and annals above mentioned, and others that still remain, which

¹ Colgan, Praef. vit. mss. Hyber.

may serve for a solid bottom to a true history of Ireland since the fifth age, that would do honour to the nation.

CHAPTER II.

THAT SUPPOSING EVEN THE CERTAINTY OR PROBABILITY OF THE ANCIENT SETTLEMENT AND MONARCHY OF THE MILESIANS IN IRELAND, OR IN GENERAL THAT OF THE IRISH REMOTE ANTIQUITIES, YET IT DOES NOT FOLLOW THAT THESE MILESIANS WERE PROPERLY SCOTS; BUT THAT, ON THE CONTRARY, IT SEEMS CERTAIN THAT THE SCOTS WERE NOT SETTLED IN IRELAND TILL ABOUT THE TIME OF THE INCARNATION, OR RATHER AFTER IT.

By all that we have said in the preceding chapter, I hope it sufficiently appears that the remote antiquities of Ireland, that is, the coming in of the Milesian colony to Ireland under Heremon, and their long succession of kings after him, during the space of twelve or thirteen hundred years before the incarnation, with the rest of the ancient facts they relate, are destitute of all those grounds and historical proofs proper to gain them credit with impartial competent judges of ancient and remote transactions of this nature; and, by consequence, that no certain proof can be drawn from them of the Milesian-Scots, as they call them, being settled in Ireland about twelve or thirteen ages, or indeed of their being settled there at all, before the incarnation of Christ.

But now I add further, that, giving and not granting that those remote antiquities concerning the ancient settlement, monarchy, and succession of the Milesian race in general were probable (however uncertain they really are), the question which I here examine would not for that be determined, but still remain dubious, to wit, whether the people properly called Scots were settled in Ireland before the incarnation. I say the people properly called Scots, by whom I mean the predecessors of those Scots whose name appears in history for the first time (as we shall show) in the third or fourth age of Christianity, who, coming to Britain generally from Ireland, and joining with the Caledonians or Picts, made war against the Romans and provincials in Britain in the fourth and fifth age. In a word, I mean those Scots from whom the Scots in Britain are descended and took their name.

For it might possibly have happened that the Milesian race had settled in Ireland, as the modern Irish tell us, twelve or thirteen ages before the incarnation, and that there had been a succession of kings of that race, from Heremon downwards (as no doubt there were most ancient inhabitants, and many kings, too, in Ireland of old, as elsewhere); and yet that none of all these have been properly Scots, nor the Scots as yet settled in Ireland, but that they came only into it long afterwards, about or after the birth of Christ; and that in a body of men accustomed to war, so as to have rendered themselves masters of most part of the country (as we see so many other nations invaded other countries in the third, fourth, and following ages after the incarnation), to have subdued the ancient inhabitants, overturned their government and set up a new one, so that the chief leaders of this new people became the first kings of the Scotish race in Ireland, and their descendants succeeded and reigned after them, whilst their chief commanders under them became the governing party, and brought most part of the ancient inhabitants by degrees under subjection. Thus the Franes invaded the Gauls, the Goths and Sweves possessed themselves of Spain, the Vandals became masters of Afriick, the Saxons of the south of Britain.

That the Scots were not the ancient inhabitants of Ireland settled there about twelve or thirteen ages before the birth of Christ, but were a foreign new people, who, after or about the times of the incarnation, came in upon the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, and rendered themselves by degrees masters of them, in the same manner as the Franes, the Goths, the Vandals, and other foreign people came in upon and subdued several provinces of the Roman empire, and by degrees incorporated themselves with them. That this was the case of the first settlement of the Scots in Ireland, is what I conceive may be shown by such arguments as, considering the darkness we are in for want of ancient historians, will suffice to render it at least highly probable, if not absolutely certain.

There are in general only two kinds of proofs or arguments by which the coming in of a new people in past ages upon the ancient inhabitants of a country, and the revolution happening upon it, can be made out. The one is the testimony of contemporary or ancient writers, the other is drawn from the effects that naturally follow upon such invasion and revolution.

As to the first kind of arguments, it supposes, necessarily, that there are extant contemporary or ancient writers near the times of such a revolution. Such testimonies we have from Gildas, Beda, and other ancient historians, domestic and foreign, of the Saxons invading the south of Britain. Such

also we have from the Roman writers, from Gregory of Tours, and other ancient monuments, of the Fraues invading the Gauls in the fifth age.

Were there extant any ancient received writings, foreign or domestic, near the times of the incarnation, that contained either the history of Ireland, or at least gave us accounts of the state and inhabitants of it, and revolutions that happened in it in these early times, we might then expect to find, as I doubt not but we should, such direct proofs of the Scots coming into Ireland as we have of the coming in of the Franks to the Gauls. But by what we have said in the preceding chapter it appears there is not extant any certain domestic history of Ireland in those early times, nor, for anything that hath yet appeared, till at least eight or nine ages (if even then) after the incarnation, nor any certain account of the transactions of Ireland, nor any certain proof that they had even the use of letters in Ireland till the fifth age, when they received Christianity.

The most ancient pieces we have now extant, believed to be written in Ireland, are the confession or apology of St. Patrick, their apostle, and his letter to Corotiens, both published first by Wareus from several very ancient MSS., and again by Hollandus; and they are quoted by the most ancient writers of the saint's life, as they are also by Usher, Colgan, and are generally esteemed by the learned as genuine; among others, by the judicious historian, M. de Tillemont, in his church history, where he prefers them to all that hath been written of St. Patrick, and makes them the foundation of the history of that saint. All this renders, indeed, those pieces very valuable, and they furnish us with some light on the state of Ireland in the fifth age, when they were written; but all they contain is some account of that saint's life and labours in planting the gospel in Ireland, and of the people to whom he preached, but nothing of the history of Ireland in former ages.

As to foreign writers, none of them before the seventh or eighth age after the incarnation gives us any distinct account of what passed in Ireland; and the little they have of it proves rather that the Scots were not there in ancient times, since they are never mentioned till the third or fourth age among the inhabitants of it, as we shall presently show.

From all this it clearly follows that the first kind of proof drawn from the testimonies of ancient writers, domestic or foreign, ought not to be expected towards fixing the time of the first settlement of the Scots in Ireland, or the finding out whether the Scots were the ancient inhabitants of it or not.

But there is a second kind of proof or argument, drawn from the usual effects with which such a revolution as the coming

in of a new and foreign people upon ancient inhabitants would be naturally followed ; and this kind of proof, as it is the only one by which a fact of this kind, in a country so destitute of all ancient historians as Ireland, can be cleared, so I conceive that it can be made out by proofs of this nature, sufficient to satisfy all impartial judges, that the Scots were not the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, and in possession of it twelve or thirteen ages, or indeed before the incarnation at all, but were a new foreign people, who, about or rather after the birth of Christ, came to Ireland as conquerors, and rendered themselves masters of it, in the same manner as the Francs came in afterwards on the Gauls, and as other foreign nations invaded and subdued other provinces.

To apply this proof to the Scots in Ireland, we need only observe the marks and characters which the earliest or surest writers or other ancient monuments furnish us with of the Scots at their first appearance in history, and in the times immediately following their being first mentioned in Ireland and Britain, and compare these marks with the first appearances and beginnings of other conquering nations in the several countries which they invaded and in which they settled, and, in particular, with the Francs settling amongst the Gauls, because we have a more distinct account of them ; and we shall see the same marks and characters of the Scots being not the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, but a new and foreign people come into it about the first ages of Christianity, as appear in the Francs in the beginning of their settlement among the Gauls.

1st. Though we had no distinct account from undoubted history and records that the settlement of the Francs in Gaul was in the fourth or fifth age, yet it would be sufficiently evident that their settlement was no sooner by this, that we never meet, in any ancient history or record, with any people settled amongst the Gauls before the fourth or fifth age, called by the name of Francs ; and that since the fifth and sixth age, all writers make mention of the Francs as inhabitants of Gaul. In like manner, though we have no ancient history that gives us a distinct account of the Scots coming into Ireland, and settling there only in the first ages of Christianity, yet it appears an undoubted proof that the settlement of the Scots in Ireland can be placed no earlier than the time of the incarnation or after it ; that the name of Scots was never heard of in Ireland, or indeed at all, till the third or fourth age after Christ ; and that they are ever afterwards mentioned as inhabitants of Ireland, or of the north of Britain.

All ancient writers before the third or fourth age, of whatever country, never called the inhabitants of Ireland but

Hyberni, Hyberionæ, etc.; and what is most remarkable, Ptolemy the geographer, in the first or second age, though he names about twenty different people inhabitants of Ireland, never mentions the Scots among them, nor indeed at all. And as for the country of Ireland, I never find it called by any writer, before the seventh age, but Hybernia, Ierne, Iris, Britannia minor; and the name of Scots is never once heard of or mentioned by any writer before the third age, as Bishop Usher grants. I might add, that we do not find the name of Scots in any writer now extant before Ammian Marcellin in the fourth age, though I doubt not but the name is more ancient, and may have been mentioned in writers that are now lost.

But as to the passages of the pretended Bengorion and Egesippus, quoted by Usher, both Usher himself and all good critics agree that they are passages of authors much posterior to the times in which those writers lived. And as to the passage, *Scoticae gentes*, etc., cited by the same Usher from St. Jerome, as being taken from Porphyrius (though even allowing it, it would not reach beyond the end of the third age), this passage is not of Porphyrius, but St. Jerome's own, in his letter to Ctesiphont, written only after the year 412. That this passage is not Porphyrius', but St. Jerome's own, the epithet he gives there to Britannia, of *fertilis provincia tyrannorum*, seems to demonstrate. For when Porphyrius, about A.D. 267, wrote the book against the Christian religion to which St. Jerome alludes in that passage, there had scarce till then appeared from Britain any considerable tyrant or usurper against the empire; whereas, betwixt that year 267 and 412, when St. Jerome wrote that letter to Ctesiphont, there had risen in Britain no less than seven tyrants or usurpers, to wit, Carausius, Alectus, Maximus, Marcus, Gratian, Constantin, and Gerontius; these four last one after another, a few years before St. Jerome wrote, which made him call Britannia deservedly fertile of tyrants or usurpers; so it appears that this passage is St. Jerome's own, and not of Porphyrius, and of consequence written after A.D. 412.

The first time, then, that we find the Scots mentioned in any ancient author yet known, is in Ammian Marcellin, towards the latter end of the fourth age. All former writers that we can find, who mention Ireland, or its inhabitants, never call them but Hyberni, and the country Hybernia, Iris, etc., and never once mention the Scotti among its inhabitants; such are Cæsar, Diodor the Sicilian, Strabo, Mela, Ptolemy, Tacitus, Pliny, Solinus. All these and other writers who speak of Ireland, some of them give a short description of it, and the names of its inhabitants, but none of them ever mentions the

Scots. And this universal silence of all writers before the fourth age that spoke of Ireland, seems a sufficient proof alone that the Scots were not of a much older settlement there; especially when it is considered that all those that speak of Ireland after the fourth age never fail to mention the Scots as inhabitants of it; such are next to Ammian, Claudian, St. Jerome, Orosius, Gildas, and others in the fifth and sixth ages.

2d. The Francs, before their first settlement amongst the Gauls, appear in history as a people unsettled, roving up and down, and seeking fixed habitations, for about two hundred years before Clovis, who gave the first form to their monarchy, and gave them a fixed establishment amongst the Gauls; so also the first account that Ammian gives of the Scots is as of an unsettled people, at least in Britain:¹ *Scoti per diversa vagantes.*

3d. Upon the settlement of the Francs among the Gauls, two people appear thenceforth in history as the mixed inhabitants of the same country, the Galli and the Franci; the first as the ancient, the second as new inhabitants, not heard of before. In like manner in Ireland, in the fourth and fifth age, two sorts of people appear as the mixed inhabitants of that island, the Hyberni and the Scotti; the first as the ancient inhabitants known in all ages before, the second, to wit, the Scotti, appear on a sudden as a new people, never heard of in Ireland till then.

4th. Though the Galli and Franci appear as mixed inhabitants of Gaul, yet in the first ages after the settlement of the Franci, they are distinguished from the Galli by their qualities as well as by their name. The Franci, as being masters or conquerors, or the military men, appear as the nobility and gentry; whereas the Galli or Gauls, the ancient inhabitants, appear as the *Coloni* or commons, as being subject to the former: of all which the learned M. Du Cange,² who makes this observation, gives us many proofs from ancient records. So after the settlement of the Scots in Ireland, though the Scotti and Hyberni appear in the fifth age as common inhabitants of that island, yet they appear distinguished by their qualities as well as by their names. The Scotti, as being the conquerors, masters, and military men, appear as the nobility or gentry, in the confession or apology of St. Patrick (written by him³ in the fifth age, and so the ancientest piece we have written in Ireland), *Fili Scotorum*⁴ & *filiae Regulorum*, which he repeats

¹ Ammian, lib. 27.

² Du Cange, Glossar. tom. ii. col. 522, etc., ad vocem Franc.

³ Ubi supra, p. 281.

⁴ Confessio S. Patricii apud Bolland. ad 17 mart. n. 18, & Epist. ad Corotium, n. 6.

over again in his letter to Coroticus, joining, in both places, the *Scoti* and *Reguli* as being synonymous equivalent terms; and again, *Una benedicta Scota nobilis*, etc., adding generally to the name *Scotus* that of *Reguli* or *Nobilis*; whereas he never calls the native Irish in those places but *Hyberionæ* or *Hyberniae*, as being the commons and ordinary people. M. de Tillemont,¹ in his *Life of St. Patrick*, takes notice of this distinction, after F. Bollandus.²

5th. The inhabitants of Gaul, before the Franks settled among them, lived most part quietly under the empire, except when forced to take arms against the many barbarous nations that overran them, or when they were obliged to take part in the schisms or divisions of the empire; and we do not read that in those times the Gauls of themselves took up arms out of ambition to invade or conquer their neighbour countries; but no sooner had the new nation of the Franks settled among them, but we find them every year in a warlike posture, ready to invade the neighbouring provinces, and enlarge their dominions.

In like manner we have no certain account that the old inhabitants of Ireland used in ancient times to come over and invade the Britains, before the coming in of the Scots to Ireland; and it appears, by what Tacitus³ writes from his father-in-law Agricola's relation of them in Domitian's time, that they were little accustomed to the use of arms, and so far from making inroads on the Britains of the north, or Caledonians, that the Irish were much inferior to them in military valour; since Tacitus tells us that Agricola had often asserted to him, that with one legion, and a few auxiliary troops, Ireland might have been conquered and possessed; whereas we see, in the same book of Tacitus, that the Caledonians were able to dispute their ground with a powerful army of the Romans, supported by auxiliaries, and commanded by so able a general as Agricola. So that in all appearance, in those ancient times, the Irish were accustomed to no foreign wars, nor had any ambition to make invasions or conquests without themselves. Eumenius seems indeed to suppose that the Britains had wars with the Irish, as well as with the Picts; but he doth not tell us whether the Britains made inroads on the Irish in their own country, or the Irish came over to invade the Britains.

But at the very first appearance of the name of Scots in history, we find them in arms, come over in warlike expeditions to Britain, joined with the Picts, invading the Roman empire,

¹ Tillemont, Hist. Eccles. tom. xvi. p. 453.

² Bolland, *ubi supra*.

³ Tacit. Vit. Agric. f. 233, n. 24.

overrunning the provincials, and giving work enough to the Roman legions; inspiring the same warlike temper into the old Irish, till, by degrees, the strength of the Scots came over and settled in North Britain, where they continued ever after in the same warlike temper; and being by degrees united into one people with the Picts of the Caledonian blood, gain ground upon the Saxons, maintain their country against the Danes, who had vanquished the Saxons, and for many ages (except when divided among themselves) defend their country and liberty against the united force of their powerful neighbours.

6th. The country of the Gauls retained still the old name of Gallia, and it alone, for a considerable time after the Francs had settled, and were generally masters of it; and it was only afterwards, and by degrees, that the kingdom of the Francs, amongst the Gauls, was called by the new name of Francia, from these new inhabitants. St. Gregory the Great, about the end of the sixth age, is believed to be the first that gives to Gaul, or rather the kingdom of the Francs amongst the Gauls, this new name of Francia; but after him, Gaul, at least the kingdom of the Francs there, is indifferently called Gallia or Francia, from the new and old inhabitants. In like manner (and this appears to me a decisive argument for what I am here proving) Ireland retained still the old name of Hybernia or Ierne, in all writers, long after the Scots were settled there, as we see by Orosius, Claudian, and other writers of the fifth and sixth age; who, whilst they call the inhabitants indifferently Scotti or Hyberni, never call the country but Hybernia, Ierne, etc. And it was only by degrees that it got the new name of Scotia from the new inhabitants the Scots, but still retained the old name of Hybernia.

St. Laurence, archbishop of Canterbury in the beginning of the seventh age, is the first that I find who gives to Ireland the name of Scotia, in his letter, mentioned by Bede,¹ to the bishops and clergy of that kingdom. After him Isidore, in the same age, and Adamnan in St. Columba's life; and from thenceforth it is called, for some ages, indifferently Hybernia or Scotia, as synonymous names from the old and new inhabitants; till at last it quite lost the name of Scotia, which followed the Scots into Britain, and was by degrees wholly appropriated to the kingdom of the Scots in the north of that island.

Now I would willingly ask, wherefore Ireland should have taken, in the sixth or seventh age, the new name of Scotia, never heard of before, unless it was from a new people of that name settled among them? since we see, in all histories and countries, that the ordinary occasion or cause of all other

¹ Bed. lib. 2, c. 4.

countries taking a new name, was from new inhabitants settling in them. Thus the Gauls took the name of Francia; a part of South Gaul that of Gothia; other parts, those of Burgundia, Normannia, etc.; South Britain, those of Saxonia and Anglia; a part of Italy, Longobardia; and the northern parts of Britain, the name of Scotia: all of them from new inhabitants bearing those names. In fine, the Irish writers make use of this as an argument to prove that the Scots in Britain² were of much later standing there than the modern Scottish historians will have them; that the name of Scotia is not given to Scotland, or the north of Britain, but in later ages.

And now to conclude. By all I have said in this chapter, I hope it sufficiently appears that the Scots, properly so called, are not originally the same race of people with the first and ancient inhabitants of Ireland, but a distinct people that came into Ireland only after the time of the incarnation; since they bear so visibly, in the fourth age, as much the same character of new inhabitants of Ireland, as the Francs, or any other of the many conquering nations of these ages, bear the character of new inhabitants in the several countries which they invaded and possessed themselves of.

As to the objections that may be made against what is here proved, that the Scots were a new and foreign people that came into Ireland only since the incarnation, and were not the ancient inhabitants of that island, these objections may be reduced to two heads, to wit: 1st. Those drawn from the pretended ancient MSS. monuments of the history of Ireland; such as are said to be the *Book of Tara*, *Psaltar Cashel*, their poets, bards, and other domestic writers. 2d. Those taken from British or other foreign writers, which² has been mentioned already as being no less favourable to the high antiquities of the Scots in Britain than to those of the Milesians in Ireland.

As to the first, to wit, the pretended ancient Irish histories, we have treated of them at full length in the former chapter; and by exposing the difficulties and objections made against them, have shown how little they are to be relied upon, or rather, how groundless they are in all that they relate of what passed in Ireland, especially before the time of the incarnation.

I easily foresee that one of the greatest objections that can be made against what hath been proved in this chapter, by those writers that are still attached to the remote antiquities of Ireland, will be drawn from their genealogies; which, as they are set down by Keating, O'Flaherty, Dr. Kenedy, etc.,

¹ Usher, Britan. Eccles. Antiquit. pp. 380, 381, 382, etc.

² *Supra*, sec. 1, c. 2, p. 114.

are carried up from King Leogaire, in St. Patrick's time, to Heremon, son to Milesius; and thence up to Noah and Adam.

But I desire, in the first place, that it be considered that the pretended ancient genealogies of Ireland were not grounded and proved, as those of modern times, by any public or private acts or documents; for as to the committee of nine, and the other pretended regulations upon these matters, attributed to some of their ancient kings and Parliaments, or assemblies of Tara, all these must still remain as dubious, and as likely to have been the fabric of more modern ages as the genealogies themselves, and the rest of the detailed accounts of their other remote antiquities, till such credible documents of them appear as have never yet been published. And, in particular, that their genealogies were not invented till they had the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures (after the gospel was preached in Ireland), appears by their carrying them up to Noah and Adam.

2d. That all the credit of these genealogies depended wholly upon that of the bards or seanachies, whose character we have seen. Now when once these genealogies passed the memory of the present age, or a part of the former, that is, five or six generations, they could neither be proved true, nor disproved, nor convicted of forgery; for these genealogies, consisting barely of single names, joined together by the word Mac, without any proof, the drawing them up required no more skill than to collect names already in use, or invent new ones, sufficient in number to carry up the genealogy of the person whom they intended to gratify, from his father or grandfather, or such of his predecessors whose names were as yet recent in the memory of men, till former ages, when nobody could contradict; and so upwards, till they grafted the name at last on some branch of the genealogies already composed (in case any such were) which led up to Milesius; whence, by former bards, the degrees were carried up to Noah. There was in our own time a Scotish gentleman of an ancient family (Urquhart of Cromarty), who took a fancy to draw up his pedigree, from age to age, up to Noah and Adam, and caused it to be printed by the title of *Pantochronocanon*;¹ or, *Pedigree of the Name of Urquhart of Cromarty, from the Creation of the World until the present Year of Christ, 1652*. I have seen the book, with many others useful to this work, by the favour of the Honourable Archibald Campbell, in his curious collection of rare books.

Now it could not fail but the first bards or seanachies that

¹ London, printed for Richard Baddely, within the Middle-Temple, A.D. 1652.

invented the Irish genealogies, being ignorant of letters, and more yet of chronology, would naturally exceed in the number of degrees or descents, having no certain rule by which they could govern themselves; and so it happened, when afterwards there arose among them bards or seanachies that had some knowledge of history or chronology, they found themselves obliged to make considerable retrenchments of the number and names of their genealogies, and so by degrees reduced them; till at last M. O'Flaherty, one of the most learned of their modern writers, comparing them with the Scripture genealogies, makes a new reformation of them, and cuts off a number of them to make them agree with the longest genealogy set down by St. Luke, as we have elsewhere observed.¹

As to the second kind of objections, that is, those taken from the British historians, the only objections worth the taking notice of are those that may be drawn from Bede or Nennius; and, first, as to Bede,² he supposes, indeed, that the Picts found the Scots in Ireland when they, the Picts, first came into Britain, which was certainly, as hath been shown elsewhere,³ long before the time of the incarnation. But, 1st, it is to be observed that Bede in that same place seems equally to suppose that the Scots came before Julius Cæsar's time, or at least before the Romans were well established, from Ireland to Britain; so that none of those learned critics, and especially the Irish, who reject the early settlement of the Scots in Britain, notwithstanding of the authority of Bede, can press his authority for the early settlement of the Scots in Ireland from his mentioning of the Scots in that island when the Picts came in. 2d. It appears by Bede's never mentioning the Caledonians, but calling the northern inhabitants of Britain by the name of Picts, at their first entry to the island, that he took his accounts of the ancient inhabitants of the north of Britain and of Ireland rather from the relation of those of his own time than from ancient monuments of history; hence he calls the most ancient inhabitants by the same names that they bore in his own time. Thus with him the first inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain are called Picti; so likewise the inhabitants of Ireland, called sometimes Scotti in Bede's time, are called Scotti by him at the first entry of the Picts to Britain.

3d. It may have happened that the stories of the Irish seanachies concerning the early coming in of the Scots to Ireland before the time of the incarnation were already begun to be broached, and perhaps spread and believed by several among the Irish and Scots in Bede's time, that is, in the

¹ *Supra*, p. 269.

² *Bed. lib. 1, c. 1.*

³ *Supra*, Book i. c. 3, art. 1.

eighth age; so no wonder if Bede, who took his accounts of Ireland from the Irish, or from the Scots with whom he conversed, believed, upon their telling him so, that the Scots were already inhabitants of Ireland and Scotland before Julius Cæsar's time, or rather before the Romans were fully established in Britain.

What may have probably given occasion to the first broaching those stories of the early settlement of the Scots in Ireland by the bards, and to their gaining credit among the Irish and Scots, was that the Scots coming into Ireland in a body of men accustomed to war, and rendering themselves by degrees masters of the ancient inhabitants, as the Francs did of a part of the Gauls, the Scots became soon the governing party in Ireland, and by the third or fourth age were become the leading men, and possessed of the sovereignty and chief places of power, and by consequence had the dispensation of all favours and rewards; and that alone was a strong temptation to such men as were the bards, accustomed to flatter and cry up all that came to be in power, and able to reward them, to ascribe to the leading men among the Scots ancient genealogies and far-fetched pedigrees, or to graft them on the genealogies of the ancient inhabitants, in case any such were already contrived. And this was the more easy to succeed and obtain credit in such ignorant times, that after four or five ages of settlement in Ireland, and twelve or fifteen generations, the time of the coming in of the Scots was begun to be forgotten, and they to be looked upon as ancient inhabitants; besides that, the Scots were by that time so intermixed as one body of people with the ancient natives, that what belonged to these last was more easily and imperceptibly attributed to the Scots. There are but too many examples of fabulous stories and inventions creeping into history, and gaining in less time an almost universal credit in countries and ages much more polished than Ireland was in those times.

What we have said here may also in a great measure serve to answer another specious objection against the Scots first coming into Ireland only about or after the times of the incarnation. This objection is drawn from what hath been elsewhere observed¹ of the order in which Bede² seems to place or rank the first settlement or coming in of the ancient inhabitants of Britain,—first the Britains, next the Picts, in the third place the Scots; and after mentioning the Scots, he speaks of the Romans coming in, and last of all of the Saxons. By this it would appear that in Bede's opinion the Scots came into Britain before the Romans, and that by consequence they must

¹ *Supra*, p. 120.

² Bed. lib. I, c. 1.

have been settled in Ireland some time before, since it is supposed that the Scots came at first into Britain immediately from that island.

This, indeed, would appear to have been Bede's opinion, and it proves very well that the Scots were esteemed in Bede's time to have been ancient inhabitants of Britain, and not lately come into it in the fifth or sixth ages, as some English writers pretend ; for there is no appearance that Bede could have attributed so ancient a settlement to a people who had been but about two hundred years in the island ; since besides that, by the fifth age, they had the use of letters, and by consequence their accounts of themselves might be more certain, —the bare tradition, from father to son, of their coming into Britain in the fifth or sixth age, would be as yet so fresh in the memory of men of the seventh and beginning of the eighth age (when Bede wrote his history), that it seems not possible that he could have been misinformed or so grossly mistaken as to suppose they came in above seven hundred years before.

But we must reason very differently upon supposition of the Scots coming in from Ireland to Britain four or five hundred years before Bede wrote his history, that is, about the beginning of the third age of Christianity (which we shall have occasion elsewhere to examine), and that they came in by degrees, and in times when the use of letters was not yet received, either in the northern parts of Britain or in Ireland, where by consequence all the knowledge of past transactions depended on the credit of their bards. In this supposition, the question being about an antiquity of settlement or possession (which all nations, the more they are ignorant, endeavour to carry the higher, and to overreach their neighbours), it was no hard matter for their bards to have advanced two or three ages the first coming in of the Scots to Britain, and to have introduced among them, before Bede wrote his history, the opinion of their being come over to Britain before the time that the Romans entered it.

This seems so much the more likely, that the bards in Ireland having begun before Bede's time to raise the settlement of the Scots in that island to a much higher antiquity than it was in effect, the bards among the Scots in Britain, being men of the same genius, could scarce fail to imitate those of Ireland, and to carry up the first settlement of the Scots in Britain to more ancient times ; and the latter end of the sixth age, or beginning of the seventh, was a proper time for that, when the kingdom of the Scots in Britain, especially during King Aidan's reign, had begun to make a more considerable figure in the island.

And it would appear that this advancing the settlement of the Scots in Britain was so much the more easy to be done, that they came not over at first in great bodies of men, but in small numbers, insensibly, and by degrees; first, to the nearest islands, and thence, as their number increased, to the western coasts of the mainland of Britain, which the Caledonians or Picts yielded with less difficulty to them, in order to have them for auxiliaries in their wars with the Romans and provincial Britains.

Thus the time of the first coming of the Scots to Britain not being remarkable by any considerable event or revolution, it was the sooner forgotten; so that after nine or ten generations had passed in so dark ages, when there was no learning in those parts, nor any records kept of past transactions, it was certainly much more easy for the bards of those times to raise the first settlement of the Scots in Britain to a much higher antiquity than it was in effect for posterior writers of the fifteenth or sixteenth age, in times of light and learning, to multiply their kings of the Scotish line, and to impose upon the nation, so as to have it received and generally believed, a new scheme of antiquities, detailed into particular facts, with a new genealogy and a new series of ancient kings, as we have already proved that it happened.

And if an emulation not to be behind in the antiquity of monarchy with the kings of England, particularly with King Edward I., who valued himself upon an ancient succession of kings in the British race down from Brutus, Locrinus, etc., contributed not a little, as it will afterwards appear, to raise in the Scots, in the beginning of the fourteenth age, the first notions of ancient kings of the Scotish line before the times of the incarnation, it is very likely that the like emulation with the Picts, or a view not to be inferior to them in so honourable a privilege as that of an ancient establishment or ancient possession, gave occasion to the Scotish bards about the seventh age to advance the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots in Britain beyond the time of the incarnation. That this emulation or vieing with the Picti contributed to it is the more likely, that, as we have elsewhere observed,¹ the Scots at last, after they came to be masters of the Pictish kingdom, carried this emulation so far as to pretend to have been established in Britain as early as, or even before, the Picts themselves.

Now, supposing that the settlement of the Scots, both in Ireland and in Britain, had been thus advanced by the bards of each country to more ancient times before Bede wrote his history in the eighth age, there is no doubt but what he relates

¹ *Supra*, p. 84, etc.

of the Scots coming to Britain before the Romans entered it was upon the information of some of the natives that gave credit to those new schemes of the bards.

I know some of the learned among the English and Irish writers give a different interpretation to this passage of the first chapter of Bede's history, and pretend that the Scots coming into Britain before the Romans doth not follow from it; and so it is nowise contrary to what I have endeavoured to prove in this chapter, to wit, that the settlement of the Scots in Ireland was not before the time of the incarnation. But I cannot help thinking that the interpretation that these learned writers put upon Bede's passage seems forced, and have therefore chosen rather to endeavour to find out by probable conjectures the true occasion of Bede's advancing this paradox, than to elude the difficulty by an evasion.

As for the passages of Nennius, the British writer, which seem to favour the remote antiquities of Ireland, and which we have elsewhere set down,¹ it is evident by Nennius that these remote antiquities were already begun to be hatched by the bards before his time; but as yet only in a confused mass, very different from the more regular order into which they were afterwards digested by more skilful hands. Nor were the inventions of the bards in Nennius' time, that is, in the ninth age, raised as yet to that height of antiquity by many hundred years to which the fertile genius of the seanachies have in posterior ages advanced them.

For, according to the reckoning of Nennius, who informs us that he had his accounts from the most learned of the Scots or Irish (*a peritissimis Scotorum*), the first coming in of the Scots to Ireland was only about six hundred years before the incarnation; whereas the later seanachies have raised their settlement and beginning of their monarchy in Ireland, some of them two thousand years, others thirteen hundred, before the incarnation; so that Nennius, far from adding any force to the story of these remote antiquities, serves rather to derogate from their credit, by showing the variations and novelty of their schemes of an ancient settlement and monarchy in the Milesian race, as it hath been elsewhere observed.²

Having now shown that the Scots are not the ancient inhabitants of Ireland, but a foreign people come in upon the ancient inhabitants only about or since the time of the incarnation, before we enter upon the examination of the precise time of their first settlement in the north of Britain, it remains to inquire of what origin they were, and whence they came at first into Ireland.

¹ *Supra*, p. 119.

² *Supra*, p. 274.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE ORIGIN OF THE SCOTS, OF THEIR NAME, AND OF THE
TIME OF THEIR SETTLEMENT IN IRELAND.

The obscurity in which the origin and remote antiquities of all the northern nations are involved, arises from their wanting all domestic monuments of ancient history, and for the most part even the use of letters, till they were polished, either by being subjected to the Roman empire, or by the light of Christianity. This we have shown in particular was, in all appearance, the case of Ireland till about the time the gospel was preached there in the fifth age, so till that time we can expect no certain accounts of the revolutions that happened among the Irish, no more than of other barbarous nations without the Roman empire, or which did not border upon or interfere with it. And far from finding any account of the Scots in the first ages of Christianity, their name is not so much as once to be met with in history, or in any of the ancient descriptions of the world left us by Strabo, Mela, Ptolemy, Pliny, or any other of the ancient geographers; nor is the name of Scots ever so much as once mentioned till the third or fourth age, as hath been already shown.¹

So in this inquiry into their origin, or the time of their coming into Ireland, the only light we must walk by is what may be borrowed by probable conjectures, grounded upon such accounts as the Roman writers give us of the state of the several barbarous nations in the neighbourhood of Ireland in the first ages of Christianity.

And first, as to the name of Scots, though it be nowhere to be met with, as it is now written and pronounced, before the third or fourth age, yet it can scarce be questioned but originally it is the same as that of the Scythæ, there being a visible resemblance betwixt the names of Scythæ and Scotti, and only some difference in the pronunciation, very usual in the names of ancient nations, according to the different accent or pronunciation of the several people that spoke or wrote of them. Thus as Gethi Gethicus are the same as Gothi Gothicus, so also from Scythæ Scythicus come Scotti Scoticus. These are Walsingham,² an English writer's words; and before him Radulfus de Diceto,³ dean of London, makes the same observa-

¹ *Supra*, pp. 282, 283, etc.

² Walsingham, *Ypodigma Neustriæ*, p. 552.

³ Rad. de Diceto inter X. Scriptores Angl. col. 627.

tion. Nennius,¹ in the ninth age, uses promiscuously the names of Scythæ and Scoti for the same people; and Gildas,² in the sixth age, calls Scythica vallis the passage through which the Scots used to invade the provincial Britains. The Germans to this day call both Scyths and Scots by the same name, Scutten.

But what is most remarkable, the Britains in their ancient tongue (as Camden³ observes) call both the nations of Scyths and Scots by the same name, Y-scot. I say this denomination of the Britains is most remarkable of all, because the Britains, on the first appearance of that new people in Britain, giving them the name of Y-scot or Scot, whether from their being originally Scyths, or rather from their resembling the Scyths by their habit, arms, and customs, gave a natural occasion to the Romans, then in possession of the south of Britain, to Latinize the name of these new enemies of the empire, and call them Scotti. And thus the origin of the name is not from the Scots themselves, or the Irish (in whose ancient language it was never in use, nor is it among our Scotish Highlanders to this day, at least among the vulgar), but a foreign denomination given them by the Britains, and from them by the Romans, and those that spoke or wrote in the Latin tongue.

This occasion and rise of the name of Scots furnishes a very probable conjecture of the country of their origin, whence they came at first to Ireland. In order to make this discovery, we are, in the first place, to find a people lying towards Ireland, called by the name of Scyths, or using their customs, habit, and arms. 2d. We are to find such a people in a motion and circumstances proper for a transmigration to Ireland in the first ages of Christianity. And we are furnished by the Roman writers with people under all these circumstances in Scandia, to the north of Ireland, and in Cantabria to the south of it; both the most proper places to invade Ireland, and a people in both these countries under these circumstances which used to put them on seeking out new habitations, and that precisely in the first ages of Christianity.

And first as to Scandia, or the ancient *Chersonesus Cymbrica*, now including the kingdoms of Norway, Denmark, etc., it hath been already observed, speaking of the Picts, that all these countries, to the extremity of the northern continent, were called by the ancients Scythia,⁴ and the inhabitants called Scyths. And they are called by Jornandes⁵ *Officina Gentium*, the workhouse of nations, because of the great multitudes that

¹ Nennius, c. 10.

² Gildas, c. 15.

³ Camden, *Scoti*.

⁴ Diodor. Sic. lib. 6, c. 7; Strabo, p. 507; Plin. lib. 6, c. 13.

⁵ Jornand. lib. 1, c. 4.

have, like an inundation, spread themselves from thence into most of the countries of Europe.

It is also to be observed that those northern nations (among whom I comprehend not only those of Scandia, but all without the farthest limits of the empire, and beyond what is now called Flanders) were all¹ subject to frequent changes of dwellings: 1st. Because of their extraordinary multiplying, which put them under a necessity of changing their habitations, and dilating themselves as their number increased; and their houses or cottages being only for a day's service, made them easily abandon their homes; 2d. Because there being no other law among them than that of the strongest, they were often constrained to abandon their habitations to a greater force; and, being bounded by the sea, they were forced to embark to seek new dwellings.

Now, by all the best accounts that we have of these early times, there is none more likely for such a transmigration of a colony of these northern nations to Ireland, or to the north of Britain, than the interval from the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius till the third or fourth age, in which the name of Scots is first heard of.

These northern nations, till Julius Cæsar conquered Gaul, had a fair field on the Continent to discharge their superfluous brood, the Gauls and Germany lying open to them. But from Julius Cæsar's time down till the third age, Gaul being conquered, and the Roman empire being generally in its full vigour, their legions quartered all over and upon the borders of the empire towards the north, and hemmed in the northern nations on that side, and the Barbars of Germany being also kept in awe by the Romans, were forced to canton within their own territories, and so left no room for the more northern nations beyond them to come in and settle among them.

Besides that, during the latter end of the reign of Augustus and the beginning of that of Tiberius, these northern nations were confined into more narrow bounds than ever before, and farther pressed back, the Roman arms under Drusus and Germanicus, as Strabo,² Tacitus,³ and Dio⁴ relate, having penetrated among the Cherusei to the Elbe, near the confines of the Chersonesus Cymbrica and the Baltic Sea.

Those nations of the north being thus penned up by the Romans on this side, and having no discharge among the nations behind them, overburdened with their own yearly increasing multitudes, it was very natural that the most warlike and resolute among them, impatient of being thus confined and enclosed, should resolve to put to sea to purchase

¹ Strabo, pp. 291, 305. ² Ibid. p. 291. ³ Tacit. lib. 1. ⁴ Dio, lib. 5.

new habitations. Nor had they a more natural course to choose than to the opposite coasts of the north of Britain; or, if repulsed by these warlike inhabitants the Caledonians, to sail from thence to Ireland, where they were more likely to succeed among a people unaccustomed to foreign wars. Nor could their coming to Ireland be more seasonably placed than during these first ages of Christianity, when the Roman empire was at the height of its power and extent. Besides that, the placing their invasion of Ireland in these first ages agrees perfectly with their first appearance in Britain, in the third or fourth age, by the name of Scots, there being some time required for their rendering themselves masters of Ireland before they could be in a condition to send out bodies of men able, in conjunction with the Caledonians or Picts, to attack the Roman empire in Britain, as we see by Ammian they did, towards the middle of the fourth century. And thus far as to the probability of the Scots coming into Ireland at first from Scandia and the north.

But, after all, since the Irish tradition will absolutely have the inhabitants of that country come from Spain, it does not appear very hard to satisfy them in that; for, 1st. This tradition may regard other colonies coming to Ireland, whereof some may probably enough have come from Spain to Ireland before the Scots settled there. 2d. We may allow that the Scots themselves came originally from Spain, and yet not depart from what we have settled about their coming into Ireland only about the beginning of Christianity, and from their having their name originally from the Scythians.

For we find, under the reign of Augustus, by Florus¹ and Orosius,² that the Romans met with extreme difficulty in reducing the Cantabrians and Asturians, with other unconquered nations of Galicia, in the northern extremities of Spain, that look towards Ireland; and that the inhabitants of those parts, who were a very warlike people, and never as yet subdued, chose rather, for the most part, to retire to the hills and rocks, and to the most desert and remote places, than to lose their liberty and submit to the Roman yoke.

It is true that Florus and Orosius, who give an account of this Cantabrian war, do not expressly inform us that any colony of the Galicians left Spain on this occasion to seek a foreign habitation; but what they relate of their aversion to submit to and live under the Romans, of the extremities they chose to be reduced to rather than to part with their liberty, makes it very credible that the most valiant of them would rather have abandoned their habitations, and seek out new ones, than submit

¹ Florus, lib. 4, c. 12.

² Orosius, lib. 6, c. 24.

themselves to the Romans. Moreover, the passage from those parts of Spain to Ireland was very easy; they wanted not shipping, nor could they be unacquainted with Ireland; and that the conquest of it was not a difficult matter, the natives being so little accustomed to foreign enemies.

Now the people who inhabited those northern provinces of Spain were of old descended from the Celts and Scyths; for we meet in those parts of Spain both with the Scythian and Celtic promontories, and a part of the inhabitants were called Celtiberi. And whatever there may be of their origin from the Scyths, being hitherto an unconquered people, the retaining the manners and arms of the ancient Scyths or Celts might give occasion enough to the Britains to give them, when they first appeared in the island, the name of Scyth or Y-scot. And their common name in Spain, which no doubt they would bring with them, being Gallaecci, or, as some write it, Callaici, might have given occasion to their calling themselves, in their own language, Gael and Gaelic, as they pronounce it. Pomponius Mela,¹ an author of these times, telling us that all those northern parts of Spain, from the Celtic promontory to the river Durius, were inhabited by the Celts, and that the Artabri, a people of these parts, were a Celtic nation, seems to prove that though these people were also called Scyths, they were all nevertheless originally descended from the Celts, and by consequence spoke the Celtic language, or a dialect of it. And the language of the ancient inhabitants of Ireland being also, as we observed before, another dialect of the Celtic, the new and old inhabitants of Ireland were sooner and more easily cemented together by degrees into one people, without any lasting difference in their languages.

To conclude, whencesoever the Scots came originally to Ireland, and from thence to the north of Britain,—whether from Scandia and other extremities of the north or from Spain, I think what is here said may suffice to show, with great probability, that they had their name from that of Scyths; whether from the Scots being originally of that people, or rather from their resembling the Scyths on their first appearance in their habit, armour, and customs; and that the placing their first coming into Ireland no sooner than about or after the times of Christianity, is conformable to the surest accounts that we have, in the earliest times, from the best historians, concerning the state of these countries from whence it is most likely that the Scots originally came out at first to Ireland, as well as to the first appearance they make in history in the fourth age by the name of Scots in Britain.

¹ Pomp. Mela, lib. 3, c. 1.

DIS. II.—*Of the Writers of the Scottish History, of the Time of the First Settlement of the Scots, and of the Beginning of their Monarchy in Britain.*

Having shown in the first dissertation how little ground there is for all that the Irish writers have delivered about the ancient settlement of the Scots in Ireland about twelve or thirteen ages before Christianity, and made it appear, by all the surest lights we can find in ancient history concerning the state of Ireland, that the first coming in of the Scots to it was in all likelihood either about or even posterior to the times of the incarnation, it follows necessarily, in the same degree of certainty, that the antiquity of the settlement of the Scots in Britain, and that of their monarchy in the Scotish line, must be proportionably abated. By what hath been said in the account that we have already given of the Picts, it hath, I hope, appeared that neither the royal family nor the inhabitants of Scotland stand in need of the remote antiquities of the Scots in Britain to prove their antiquity beyond that of any kingdom of Europe. And by the discussion we have made at length of the accounts given us by Boece, Buchanan, and their followers, of their forty kings of Scotland preceding Fergus, the son of Erch, commonly called Fergus II., it hath, I conceive, been made evident that the history of these forty kings can be of no service, at least among impartial judges, to the antiquity of the Scotish monarchy, and, as it is set forth by these historians, hath very much prejudiced the rights of it. This supposed, I hope that the lovers of truth among the learned of our countrymen will not find fault, after due examination, with the freedom that I have taken, in settling the beginning of our monarchy in the Scotish line, to depart from the schemes of our historians in modern ages, and that I take, among other vouchers, for my guides the few remains that we have of our more ancient writers.

And therefore, in order to put what I am to treat of in a better light, it seems necessary, before I enter upon the examination of the epoch of the settlement of the Scots and beginning of their monarchy in Britain, to give previously a short and distinct account of the writers of the history of Scotland.

So this second dissertation shall contain three chapters. In the first, I shall treat of the writers of our history. In the second, I shall examine the era of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain, and of the beginning of the monarchy in the Scotish line. In the third, for a general answer to all objections against what is here established, I shall endeavour to give

an account of the different steps and degrees by which the remote antiquities of the Scots grew up, by length of time, in the several hands through which they passed into the plan of history in which they are delivered by the modern writers.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE WRITERS OF THE SCOTISH HISTORY.

I shall reduce all that concerns the writers of the Scottish history to these three heads: 1st. Of the writers of our history in general; 2d. Of the many disasters befallen in past ages to the records and monuments of our history; 3d. Of the monuments of our history which yet remain.

ART. I.—*Of the Writers of the Scotish History in general.*

It cannot be reasonably doubted but that the Scots, as well as other nations, had anciently writers of their history long before Fordun, and even Stillingfleet¹ does not doubt of that. To say nothing here of Gildas, who, according to the most ancient account we have of his life,² was born at Aleluyd or Dunbarton, in the north of Britain, the most ancient pieces of history written in Britain that are extant are of authors living in Scotland, and who wrote before the Saxon historian Bede. Such are Cumineus and Adamnanus, both abbots of Ycolmkill; who, besides other historical treatises, wrote the life of St. Columba, apostle of the northern Picts. These works are still extant, and received by all the learned; and in them are several passages relating both to the Pictish and Scotish history, and to their civil and religious customs, the names of some of their ancient kings, and some account of their actions, above eleven hundred years ago. Nor can it be doubted, with any tolerable ground, but these same authors, or some of their successors or other religious men in that ancient monastery of Ycolmkill (where the kings of Scotland used anciently to be crowned before the union of the Pictish and Scotish kingdoms, and where they all had their burial-place till the eleventh age),—it

¹ Stillingfl. Antiq. Brit., Praef. p. xvii.

² The life of Gildas was written by a monk of Ruise in Little Brittany, and published by F. Mabillon, Sæc. Benedictin, tom. i.

cannot be doubted but some of the religious men of that monarchy would record the succession, lives, deaths, and chief actions of the kings, and the more remarkable transactions of the kingdom.

The same thing may be said of the ancient religious houses of Abirnethy, Dunkeld, Kilrimund or St. Andrews, Brichen, and others. Would all these houses, where, no doubt, there were men capable to write, against the custom of all other such places, in all countries, since they had the use of letters, in contradiction to the natural inclination of mankind, leave their posterity in ignorance? Were not their religious and civil interests so interwoven with the knowledge of past and the preservation of present transactions, that they must be supposed to have been, against common sense, unmindful of the first not to have recorded the last? In short, such negligence and supineness among men otherwise studious and knowing, would suppose either a formed design of entailing ignorance on posterity, or the extinction of all sense of humanity. Nor needs more be said, since there cannot be the least doubt but that the Scots and Picts had anciently writers of history, as well as other nations.

An author of the twelfth age, contemporary to Andrew, Bishop of Catness (who died¹ A.D. 1185), who is quoted by Camden,² and is still extant,—this ancient writer, in a description of Albany, the ancient name of Scotland, makes mention of our ancient histories in these words: ‘Legimus in historiis & chronicis antiquorum Britonum, & in gestis & annalibus antiquis Scottorum & Pictorum,’ etc.³ There were then extant chronicles and annals containing the actions of the Scots and Picts, and these too of so long a standing, that they were esteemed ancient by an author of the twelfth age.

ART. II.—*Of the many Disasters befallen the Monuments of the Scots History in past Ages.*

As to the want there is at present, and in these later ages, of ancient histories and other works of ancient writers among the Scots, this will not seem a considerable objection against their having had such in former times, to any who will consider the many disasters that have happened to ancient histories, MSS., and monuments of all kinds in our country; but it will rather seem a wonder that we have any remains of them at all, after so general and redoubled misfortunes that have happened to them: 1st. By casual accidents, more

¹ Chr. Mayl. ad hunc an.

³ Append. num. 1.

² Camden, in Scotia.

frequent in Scotland than in most other countries of old. 2d. By a set purpose, as our historians relate, of a powerful enemy, master of the kingdom, and a formed resolution to abolish or carry off all ancient monuments, records, or documents of past transactions, especially as to our civil antiquities. 3d. By the zeal of John Knox, and others of his spirit, among our first Reformers, equally animated and resolved to destroy all ecclesiastical monuments.

SEC. I.—*Of Casual Accidents.*

And in the first place, how great a loss of records of history and ancient monuments ensued, on the frequent invasions and ravages made by the Danes, in the famous monastery of Yeolmkill, during the ninth and tenth ages? Historians¹ reckon up no less than six different devastations of it in the tenth age; insomuch that St. Margaret, in the eleventh, found it quite ruined, and rebuilt it anew, as Oder. Vitalis,² a contemporary historian, relates. What further destruction and loss of ancient records, over all the kingdom, happened by the wars with the Piets, before they had totally submitted, by the ravages of the same Danes, especially in times when the houses, as was ordinary in those days, and long after, were generally all of wood,—which is the reason we find often in our history conflagrations, not of houses only, but of whole towns, and sometimes many towns burnt in one year; as A.D. 1244,³ no less than eight of the royal burghs, without any foreign invasion, were burnt to ashes; and many others, both towns, churches, and abbeys, at other times and occasions, especially on this side of the Forth, by the frequent invasions of the English.

SEC. II.—*Destruction of our Historical Monuments by King Edward I. of England.*

As to the second occasion of the loss of our histories and other ancient records and monuments, it was not by accident or casual, as at other times, but, as our other writers relate, a formed design to abolish, if possible for ever, all memory of past transactions among the Scots. We have already mentioned how, after the untimely death of King Alexander III.

¹ Chron. Ins. Hyensis ex Colg. Triade Thaumat. p. 498.

² ‘Inter cetera bona, quæ nobilis illa hera feceret, Huense monasterium quod . . . tempestate preliorum & longa vetustate dirutam fuerat, fidelis regina redificavit.’—Oderic. Vital. *inter Scriptores Normannie*, pp. 701, 702.

³ Fordun, lib. 14, c. 19.

of Scotland, in the debate among the competitors, especially betwixt John Baliol and Robert Bruce concerning the right of succession to the crown, King Edward I., known among the Scots by the surname of Longshanks, having got himself chosen umpire betwixt the two contending parties, and having in that quality obtained the custody of the kingdom, and thus becoming master of all the castles and strengths thereof, in order to put in possession of it whichever of the two should be found to be next heir by law and custom, under pretext of examining the order and right of succession, according to the use and precedents in former reigns in Scotland, to which he soon added a new pretence of searching in the Scotish histories and records for proofs of his pretended superiority over Scotland, he caused a search to be made over all the churches, monasteries, libraries, and archives of the kingdom, and all the histories and ancient chronicles to be gathered up; and getting them once in his possession, together with all the public records, he caused some of them to be carried up to England, and burned and destroyed the rest.

King Edward's aim and intention in this was palpable enough, to wit, that the Scots being quite destitute of all certainty of past transactions, and deprived of all proofs and evidences of their just rights and privileges, as well as of the knowledge of all the brave actions of their ancestors, he might more easily enslave them, and impose what he pleased upon them, without their being in a condition to produce either history or record to defend themselves or dispute his pretensions. And we have two visible proofs of this destruction of our histories and records, and, in consequence, of the ignorance in which the Scots were of the ancient state and history of the kingdom,—we have, I say, two full proofs of this in the debate and process about our independency, A.D. 1301, before Pope Boniface VIII., and in the Scotish nobility's letter to Pope John XXII., A.D. 1320.

It appears, by the English writers and public records, that King Edward's animosity against all the titles or marks of honour or antiquity of the monarchy of Scotland, carried him to take away or destroy all that could preserve the memory of its being a kingdom, such as the crown and the regalia,¹ the famous stone chair² in which our kings used to be enthroned, and even the abbey of Scone itself, where they were wont to be crowned. This same animosity he transmitted to his son Edward II., during whose reign we meet with repeated remarks³

¹ Math. Westmonast. p. 428, n. 17, 18.

² Walsingham.

³ Rymer's Fœder. tom. ii. pp. 1000, 1003, 1031, 1043.

of his pressing solicitations to the pope to have that abbey destroyed, or removed elsewhere.

But of this searching for, destroying, or carrying off our records or histories, we have ample proofs, not only in Boece and our other modern historians, but in writers and records, both Scotish and English, much more ancient; and some of these very times.

We have the fullest account of it in the preface to the *Chronicle of Couper*, which I have set down already,¹ written about three hundred years ago, in these words: ‘At ipse (R. Edwardus) statim occasione, ut prætendebat, cognoscendi quis eorum (Bayliol an Bruce) per vetustorum grammatum indagationem, pleniorum in regno (Scotiæ) vindicare poterat facultatem, rimatis regni cunctis librariis, & ad manus ejus receptis authenticis & antiquatis historiarum chronicis, aliquantas secum & ad Angliam abstulit, reliquas vero flammis incinerandas despiciabiliter commisit.’

All the continuators of Fordun’s history, in the fifteenth age, take notice of these searches made everywhere, by King Edward’s order, for the ancient annals and chronicles of Scotland; among others, the continuation of Fordun attributed to Bishop Elphinston, in the Bodleian library, gives much the same account of this inquiry as the rest; and that King Edward was not content to make search through Scotland alone, but in all places where any Scotish history might be found:² ‘Exquiruntur interim gesta & chronica tam in regno Scotiæ, Angliæ, Hyberniæ, quam Franciæ . . . non tantum de jure & consuetudine eorum (competitorum) propter decisionem quæstionis inter Robertum de Broys & Joannem de Balliolo, verum etiam magis ad investigandum & inquirendum de jure regis Angliæ super subjectione regni Scotiæ.’ By this we see the endeavours King Edward made to get into his hands all chronicles and histories of Scotland; not only those within the kingdom, but those also that might be in England, Ireland, and that part of France where he was master.

For a further proof of the histories of Scotland in being at the time of this search made by Edward for them, and carried to him to be inspected for deciding the right of the competitors, Knyghton,³ an English writer, informs us expressly that King Edward ‘caused a search to be made for all the chronicles in the monasteries, and in all places of the kingdom of Scotland,

¹ *Supra*, p. 125.

² *Scotichron.* (Elphinston) mss. Bibl. Bodl. lib. 8, c. 11.

³ ‘Statimque rex (Edwardo) pro certiori fide habenda fecit quærere & examinare omnes chronicas in abbatii cunctis locis regni (Scotiæ) per datam quindecim regum Scotiæ.’—*Knyghton inter X. Scriptores Angliæ*, col. 2469, n. 23.

and caused them to be brought up to him and examined, concerning the order of succession in the preceding times, for the space of fifteen reigns or successions backwards,' which reached back to the reign of King Keneth III. in the tenth age. No doubt these chronicles contained the history of the Scotish kings from the beginning; but there was no occasion, in the present debate betwixt the competitors concerning the right of hereditary succession, of going farther back than to this Keneth III., he being the author of the law for establishing more fixedly the succession to the immdiate heir, of what age soever, as all our historians agree;¹ the account of the succession of the kings who preceded Keneth III. could not be so serviceable to the decission of the present case.

But we have an ample testimony of King Edward's carrying off or destroying our records, histories, and all the ancient monuments of the kingdom, from a public document of these very times, presented, A.D. 1301, to Pope Boniface VIII., in the name of the three states of the kingdom of Scotland, whereof I shall have occasion to give a fuller account. At present I shall only remark what they say of the want they were in of their ancient records and histories, by the havoc made of them by King Edward; by which the Scots were deprived of many helps these records and titles would have furnished them in the defence of their rights and privileges: 'De² iis autem omnibus & aliis regni Scotiae defensionibus, libertatibus & juribus existentia monumenta publica in thesauraria regni Scotiae, idem rex Angliae (Edwardus) cum regni Scotiae habuit custodiam ex eadem thesauraria abstulit, & vi & metu secum in Anglia cum multis aliis bullis, cartis & muniimentis regni Scotiae, cum quibus confirmabantur regni Scotiae privilegia memorata & libertates,' etc.

Another no less authentic document we have, dated the 12th of August 1291, printed by Prinn³ among his collections from the rolls. It is a precept of King Edward's to the keepers of Edinburgh Castle, to deliver up all the charters, instruments, rolls, and writs whatsoever that might concern the rights of the competitors, or his own pretended title to the superiority of Scotland, to be carried off and placed where he should appoint; and these to be put into the hands of five persons, two Scots, and three English; and these last to act by themselves, if the two first happened to be hindered. All which was accordingly executed, and all either lost or destroyed, or

¹ Fordun, lib. 4, c. 29.

² Instructiones prelat. baron. & cons. Scotiae contra R. Edw. ap. Scotichron. lib. 8, c. 52, edit. Th. Hearne, pp. 825, 876.

³ Prinn's Collect. tom. ii. p. 545.

carried up to London; whereof the remains of our records, partly printed by M. Rymer, partly to be met with as yet in the Tower of London and archives of Westminster, make too evident a proof. Among others, there is in the Cotton Library (Nero, C. iii.) an inventory of the instruments touching the kingdom of Scotland, kept in the archives of Westminster, whereof one hath for title, 'Tres scedulae facientes mentionem de bullis, chartis, & aliis inventis in thesauro regis Scotiae apud Edinburgh.'

And as to Edward's carrying up to England what was not destroyed of our histories: 1st. *The Chronicle of Mayros*, continued till near these times, as both the subject and character of the writing manifest, and abruptly broken off a few years before King Edward's invasion, may be reckoned, for one proof, sufficient enough. It is still preserved in the Cotton Library, in the original ms. 2d. In the same library there are other two MSS., which contain extracts of four different chronicles of Scotland; the first is Claudio, D. vii., and contains a collection of many extracts of different histories, whereof the fourth bears the title of *Nomina Regum Scottorum qui regnaverunt post Pictos*; and this extract is written before John Fordun's history. This series of our kings is taken from two of our ancient chronicles compared together. The author marks their differences thus, *In alio libro sic*, etc. The other ms. is Vitellius, A. 20, under the title of *Historia Angliae a Bruto ad A.D. 1348*. In the end of this collection the author gives a chronological series of our kings that reigned since the Picts, with a short account of their lives, from two other Scotish chronicles distinct from the former. So we see these two English writers had in England no less than four distinct books or chronicles of Scotland, all much older than Fordun. I might also reckon among the remains of our chronicles carried up to England, that chronicle of Edinburgh published in *Anglia Sacra*; for it cannot be doubted but the latter part of that chronicle was written by a canon of Holyrood House. In short, almost all that remains to us of monuments of our civil history, antecedent to King Edward I.'s invasion, have been found in England, some of which will be in particular mentioned hereafter, and inserted in the appendix.

And how many more of this kind have been carried up, of which we have no account? As to these two extracts of our Scotish chronicles in the Cotton Library, made by English writers, the intention of these collectors being only to extract the series of the kings of Scotland, from the union of the Pictish and Scotish kingdoms in one monarchy, as the title bears, they begin their extracts no further up; though it is

very likely that these Scotish chronicles whence they are taken contained a complete history or series of our kings, from the beginning of the monarchy.

However that be, these chronicles are now nowhere that we can hear of to be found entire; nor have we any complete chronicle or history of our kings from the beginning, more ancient than that of John Fordun.

After all, it must be considered that King Edward was a declared enemy of the Scotish nation, and was, besides, animated against them by their unrelenting endeavours to shake off his yoke. Their frequent rising in arms to recover their liberty, after he had thought them totally subdued, enraged him against them, and made him resolve to destroy all marks of a kingdom or a free nation, and all that could renew the memory of their ancient glory and independency. But we do not find that he designedly either burnt their churches or religious houses, or that, with the civil histories and records, he either carried off or destroyed the writs, records, registers, or libraries of their churches. The destruction of these was reserved for other hands, and those, too, of natives of Scotland.

SEC. III.—*Destruction of Historical and of other Ancient Monuments at the Scotish Reformation.*

The third loss or destruction of ancient records, histories, and all sorts of mss. in Scotland, and chiefly those relating to ecclesiastical matters, was occasioned by the zeal of our first reformers in the sixteenth age. It is with reluctance that I revive the memory of that tragedy; but I cannot but give here an account of it, in order chiefly to answer the objection drawn from the few remains that are now to be found in Scotland of records, ancient histories, and mss. of any kind, if compared with the plenty they have still of them in England, notwithstanding the reformation equally made in that kingdom; from whence it is inferred, by some that are not enough acquainted with the transactions at the Reformation in both kingdoms, that the scarcity which we have ever since in Scotland of mss. must proceed from there having been but few of them even before the Reformation, otherwise why might there not have remained after it as many ancient mss. in Scotland in proportion as in England?

To answer this objection, drawn from the few remains of mss. we have since the Reformation, it is sufficient to expose the plain matter of fact from Protestant writers who lived at or near that time; and, in the first place, to observe the vast

difference there was as to records and MSS. betwixt the method by which the Reformation was carried on in England, and that in which it was hurried on in Scotland.

1st. In England, the Reformation was begun and carried on by authority of the sovereign, and had the outward countenance of legal proceedings. In Scotland, the ringleaders of the Reformation, far from any countenance of the sovereign or laws, were in open rebellion against the queen, then their sovereign, and acted in defiance of all the then standing laws.

2d. In England, the cathedral churches, with all their buildings, records, and libraries, were left untouched, at least in the first heat of the Reformation. In Scotland, the buildings, records, archives, and libraries of the cathedrals were no more spared than those of the abbeys and monasteries.

3d. In England, the suppressing or defacing of abbeys and monasteries was not permitted to the multitude or rabble,¹ but deputies on purpose appointed by authority, with express order to preserve all things of value, to register and make an account of them; and, in particular, care was taken to preserve all evidences, MSS., and records.

And under the reign of King Henry VIII., upon the dissolution of the abbeys and monasteries, so great care was taken for the preservation of all ancient monuments of history, that, A.D. 1543,² by a special writ of that king, commission was given to John Leland, a learned and zealous antiquary, ‘to peruse and search all the libraries of the monasteries and colleges throughout the whole realm that were then dissolved and broken up, that, as much as might be, all ancient monuments of the land . . . might be preserved.’ And notwithstanding all these precautions, Leland tells us that many of these monuments were destroyed.

How much more in Scotland, where no such precaution was used, nor was it practicable, the Government being at the time unhinged; and the executioners of this reformation of churches, as it was called, being the Gentlemen of the Congregation and an inconsiderate multitude, with arms in their hands against their sovereign, led on by the fiery exhortations of their new preachers, with a blind zeal to burn and destroy all monuments of religion as superstitious and idolatrous, and particularly animated against all MSS. and records relating to religion, in order to abolish the memory of what they termed idolatry, and especially to burn all books that had red letters, as belonging to the Popish worship, by which means such MS. histories that came in their way were sacrificed without distinction, all of

¹ Burnet's Hist. Ref. tom. i. Collect. p. 152.

² Strype's Memorials of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 385.

them having the titles in miniature, or red letters, as well as books of liturgy or laws. And even in the burning the books of the old liturgy we made considerable historical losses, for it is to be observed that frequently in old missals, breviaries, and such others, where there were, at the beginning or end, blank leaves, the churchmen or religious men of these times used to fill them up, for their own use, with extracts or copies of parts of the history or chronology of the country. I have seen some of this kind; but the most valuable I have met with was at Drummond Castle, the seat of the noble family of Perth, where, among the remains of an ancient library belonging to it, I found in an ancient breviary, on vellum, written about the end of the fourteenth age, an exact chronology, beginning A.D. 1067, at the marriage of Malcolm III. and S. Margaret, and from thence down till about A.D. 1390 (when it appears to have been written), containing the principal transactions of the kingdom, each with its proper date of the year, and often of the day and month. In the same library there is, among other MSS., a valuable sacramentary or missal, in a Saxon or Irish character, that appears to be about seven hundred years old, in the same character as the MS. sacramentary, entitled *Missa S. Columbani*, in the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh.

And I doubt not but if I had been able to travel, and been allowed freedom to go through the kingdom into the ancient seats of others of our nobility and gentry, I might have met with others of that kind; for what were saved of the monuments of history, such as some of the copies of the *Scotichronicon* and a few others, owed their preservation to the care of some noblemen or gentlemen into whose hands they happened to fall when all was going to wreck.

4th. In England, the Reformation, as to religious places, was carried on gradually by certain steps, and those authorized by public Acts of Parliament or Commissions, all which were as many warnings to those concerned to prepare against the storm. In Scotland, nothing contributed more to the general loss of records, MSS., and monuments of history, than that sudden and unforeseen invasion, plundering, and burning of religious houses, like a hurricane or violent storm, that drove all before it, before anybody but the contrivers was aware; and what is most to be lamented, this storm fell more violently and more suddenly on these religious places which were the chief repositories of ancient records and MSS., and which, being more remote from the invasions of England, had been till then preserved more entire. To instance in a few examples.

In St. Andrews, as being the metropolitan church, were kept

the chief ecclesiastical records of the kingdom ; and being the most ancient seat, and in great veneration even in the time of the Pictish kings, the most ancient records or histories, both of the Picts and Scots, were more safely preserved there than anywhere else, being most remote from the ordinary seat of war. And now of all those ancient monuments, we hear not of any other remaining but one or two chartularies. The reason is obvious. John Knox himself,¹ who carried on the work, tells us the Reformation at St. Andrews, that is, the ransacking some churches and razing others, was carried on all on a sudden with expedition, upon an exhortation which he himself made to the people on our Saviour's driving the buyers and sellers out of the temple,² whereby he so inflamed the rabble, that they went instantly to work, and made spoil of the churches, burnt the archives, and razed the monasteries of the Black and Greyfriars.

Scoon was the place appointed for the coronation of our kings, where, till the time of King James I., all the great councils or Parliaments used frequently to be held, and, by consequence, where the accounts of all public transactions were most likely to be preserved ; yet we have nothing left of all these ancient records. And no wonder, for on the 28th of June 1559, as Spotswood³ and John Knox⁴ relate, the royal palace, and chiefly the church and abbey, were totally consumed to ashes by the furious reformers of Dundee and Perth ; notwithstanding that Knox, as he says, and others of the chief reformers, being content that the church was reformed, that is, spoiled and plundered, endeavoured to stop the fury of the mob from burning the palace and church, but in vain. The people, once possessed by his declamations that all such places were to be made sacrifices of, were not to be stopped in the heat of their fury.

The Blackfriars or Dominicans of Perth, *Domus fratrum prædicatorum de Perth*, was famous for being the ordinary place of meeting of all our national councils, which by an order, settled above five hundred years ago, were to be yearly kept by all the bishops and clergy of the kingdom ; and whereof we have on record an account of many such councils held anciently in Scotland, both in that church and in others. I shall subjoin to this section an index of the dates of such of these councils as I have met with on record ; but, except the copy of the canons preserved in a chartulary of Aberdeen, I could never as yet hear of the acts or canons of any of them before the year 1549. The reason is plain ; these acts and canons, besides the

¹ Knox's Hist. p. 150.

³ Ibid. p. 125.

² Spotswood's Hist. pp. 123, 124.

⁴ Knox's Hist. p. 155.

authentic copies deposited in St. Andrews and other churches, were of course kept in the archives of this convent of the Dominicans of Perth, to be represented at each council; now this convent and church suffered the same calamity as that of St. Andrews, or rather a greater, with no less expedition and suddenness. Upon the 11th of May 1559, the reformers, being assembled in arms against their sovereign at Perth, after a vehement declamation of John Knox against churches and convents as monuments of idolatry, and enforcing the commandment of God for destroying all such places, the rabble rose and destroyed not only this convent and church of the Blackfriars, but those of the Greyfriars, and of the Charterhouse or Carthusians (a building, says Knox,¹ of wondrous cost and greatness),—all these were so destroyed, that in two days' time the walls only remained of all these stately edifices. It is Knox himself, who hounded out or led on the furious mob in this wretched expedition, that hath thought fit to record it, with many other such noble exploits, more becoming the Goths or Vandals than an apostolical man, as he pretended to be. This made Johnston, a zealous Protestant writer, but a lover of his country, speaking of the mischiefs that Knox occasioned to the kingdom, characterize him as a man² ‘famous for the burning of churches, and for the renewing, in his native country, the barbarous devastation of the Vandals,’ etc.

These were a part of the exploits of our reformers against all ancient religious monuments of their native country, performed in the first year of their setting up, and may be chiefly attributed to the rabble, inflamed by the violent declamations of their new preachers. But, as if the fate of the new Reformation had depended on abolishing all memory of antiquity in the kingdom, the exploits of the second year were more fatal to all remains of ancient monuments, records, or history, than all that had hitherto happened.

The leading men of the Reformation met together in their usual manner, without the commission or authority of their sovereign, and, among other Acts, ‘passed one,’ says Archbishop Spotswood,³ ‘for demolishing cloisters and abbey churches, such as were not yet pulled down; the execution whereof was committed to the most violent men of the party,—for the west, to the Earls of Arran, Glencarn, etc.; for the north, to the

¹ Knox's Hist. pp. 136, 137.

² ‘Verum enimvero Johannes Knoxius templorum incendiis, & Wandalica vastitate notissimus, qui priscae pietatis monumenta, obtenu religionis diruit, companas & plumbea ecclesiarum tecta sacrilega rapacitate invasit, intestinis dissidiis accendendis acerrimam facem prætulit.’—Rob. Johnston, *Hist. Rerum Britan. Amstelod.* 1655, p. 2, n. 40.

³ Spotswood, pp. 174, 175.

Lord James, Priour of St. Andrews; and for the in-countries, to some barons who were held the most zealous.'

'Thereupon,' adds the same writer, 'ensued a pitiful devastation of churches and church buildings throughout all parts of the kingdom, for every one made bold to put their hands, the meaner sort imitating the example of the greater. No difference was made, but all churches either defaced or pulled to the ground. The holy vessels, and whatsoever else they could make gain of, as timber, lead, and bells, were put to sale: the very sepulchres of the dead were not spared; and, among others, those of all our kings and queens since King Malcolm III. at Dunfermlin, and elsewhere, as at Scoon, Arbroth, Melros, the Charter-house of Perth, etc., insomuch that of all our kings and queens there is not so much as one monument left entire within Scotland.'

The registers of the churches and bibliothecs or libraries were cast into the fire, says Spotswood; and these were so entirely destroyed, that if in Scotland there had happened a debate, such as lately in England (into which I do not enter), about the consecrations or ordinations of bishops and priests, either before or about the time of the Reformation, I do not believe that of all our ancient bishops and priests, ordained within the country, there could have been found the register or act of consecration or ordination of any one of them,—so careful were our first reformers to sweep clean away all that could renew the memory of the religion in which they had been baptized, and all that belonged to it, of which it were easy to give surprising instances; but this is a sufficient one, of the difference betwixt the violent manner in which the Reformation, as to all old MSS. or records, was carried on in Scotland, and the moderate course which was followed in England, in which, during this late debate concerning ordination of bishops, so many public acts and registers of churches have been produced.

Now, as nobody that hath the least tincture of ecclesiastical discipline can doubt but that in all the cathedral churches of Scotland in former times, besides the archives, where the proper records of each church were preserved, there were registers of all ordinations of priests and inferior ministers, and of all other ecclesiastical acts belonging to that diocese,—that at St. Andrews, the metropolitan church, besides the archives where all the records and rights of the church, such as bulls of popes, charters of the kings, all ecclesiastical acts, such as those of national councils, of diocesan synods, of processes in the ecclesiastical court, etc., were preserved,—there were also registers where all the consecrations of bishops within the

province or within the kingdom, all ordinations, dispensations, etc., were in course recorded ; and though since the time of the Reformation all these original records have no less entirely and universally disappeared than if they never had been (excepting some of the chartularies), yet no person of understanding would conclude, from the present want, that there never had been any such original records or registers in Scotland.

In like manner it were very unreasonable, after all the disasters which have happened to our MSS. of all kinds, to conclude, from the few remains there are of our ancient histories and chronicles, that there were not anciently as many of that kind proportionably in Scotland as in other countries ; for it was not barely ecclesiastical monuments that suffered in the times of our Reformation. For since abbeys, convents, and churches, where our chronicles and other historical monuments used to be written and preserved, were burnt or destroyed, and that generally on a sudden, and without forewarning, so as that nothing could be removed or secured, it cannot be easily conceived how many valuable records or monuments of all kinds perished in their ruins.

'For, in a word,' says Spotswood,¹ 'all was ruined ; and what had escaped the first tumult did now undergo the common calamity, which was so much the worse, that the violences committed at this time were coloured with the warrant of an apparent public authority.' Thus Archbishop Spotswood, and more to this purpose, where he lays the blame chiefly on Knox and others of the first preachers of the Reformation, and on their misapplying Scripture texts to excite the people to react in their native country the part that the Goths and Vandals had acted on the Roman empire.

But what is further to be regretted, and deserves to be particularly taken notice of in this promiscuous burning of religious houses, with the registers and libraries of churches, is, that besides those historical and other records that might have been known and valued by the churchmen or religious, who were the inhabitants and possessors of these churches or convents, it frequently happened that in the libraries of the churches and monasteries of ancient establishment there were old chronicles, records, acts and canons of councils, and other valuable monuments, civil and ecclesiastical, of which the actual possessors of these churches or convents (especially in those days when there was no knowledge of critical learning, and as little taste of antiquity) either took no notice, or were not skilled enough to know the true value of them. Nor was

¹ Spotswood, p. 175.

this ignorance and neglect of ancient monuments peculiar to many churchmen and religious men in Scotland in the ages preceding the Reformation, but too common in all other countries in those days, and even in after times.

Thus we have seen in the last age, when the true taste of antiquity, of critical learning, and of discernment of genuine ancient MSS. revived, how many valuable monuments of history, of councils, of fathers, of ecclesiastical writers, and other pieces of all kinds, some of them whose names and titles had never been known or heard of out of the houses where they had been at first composed, others that were believed to have been lost,—how many such valuable monuments have been discovered, and, if I may say so, dug up from the bottom of old libraries in monasteries and churches, where they had lain buried sometimes unknown to their possessors; and this particularly by the labours, skill, and diligence of such men as Dacherius, Canisius, Mabillon, Baluze, Labbe, Martene, and many others abroad, who have enriched, and daily continue to enrich, the republic of letters with so many volumes of collections of ancient monuments of all kinds, and among these so many ancient chronicles and annals which had never been known out of the houses where they were found, and had infallibly perished with them, without ever being heard of, had they met with the fate of the churches and abbeys of Scotland.

And, not to go out of Britain, whence have we in England the *Dccem* and the *Quindecem Scriptorcs*, the *Anglica, Normanica*, etc., published by Camden, the collection of councils in two volumes by Spelman, those in *Anglia Sacra* in other two, and other such ancient monuments, but from the remains of the libraries of the churches and monasteries? Several of which had never been known or heard of, even as to their names and titles, no more than those in Scotland, had not Leland made his literary voyages and searches, and had the English monasteries and churches met with such thorough reformers as those in Scotland.

Had our ancient churches, abbeys, and convents, with their libraries, stood till these times that the taste and value of the genuine monuments of antiquity is renewed in our country, as elsewhere, what might not, for example, have been found at Abernethy, the most ancient church in Scotland, and which had subsisted from the first conversion of the Picts in the fifth and sixth age, which had a proper chronicle of its own¹ (mentioned in the *Scotichronicon*, but perished now with the rest), and where the Keledees remained till the latter end of the thirteenth age; in Kilrimund or St. Andrews, in Dunkeld, in

¹ *Scotichron. Paslaeten. lib. 4, c. 12, in Biblioth. Regia Londin.*

the priory of the Lochleven, all which were already famous in the Pictish times. What remains might not have been found in all these of the Pictish historical monuments ? and of the Scottish in the same, as well as in Scoon, Dunfermlin, St. Colmsinch, Restennot, etc.? And if the zeal of our reformers must needs ruin these stately edifices (according to John Knox's famous maxim, 'that the surest means to hinder the rooks to come back was to burn their nests'), at least had the libraries and MSS. been preserved, or had there been depited, before they were destroyed, antiquaries, such as Leland in England, that knew the true value of ancient pieces, to inspect and make catalogues of them, to preserve and put in safety the more precious, etc.; had we had in the heat of this new kind of reforming the church, when so many valuable pieces of antiquity that had escaped the fire were sold for almost nothing to the bookbinders, grocers, etc.,—had we had in those days men of the fine taste and temper of Sir Robert Cotton and others in England, who preserved so many of those persecuted remains and monuments of their forefathers' piety and glory,—nay, had we then had men of such a public spirit as some in our own time, I doubt not but we might in that case have had collections of Scottish ancient monuments, no less valuable for Scotland than those of the Cotton Library and others are for England, especially of ecclesiastical matters, after which it appears that King Edward I. in his searches had not designedly inquired, so they remained much more entire, till the time of the Reformation, than what concerned the civil history.

And now it is easy to perceive the vast disparity there was, as to the loss or preservation of records and all sort of MSS., betwixt the manner in which the Reformation was carried on in England and that in which it was hurried on in Scotland; and that whatever plenty there might have been in former times in Scotland of historical, ecclesiastical, or other monumets of antiquity, it is rather a wonder that any at all should have remained, than that there should be so very few in comparison of what have been preserved in England.

And after this account of the fate of our ancient monuments of this kind, especially those of ecclesiastical matters, I think I need not insist upon refuting the groundless story of their having been transported abroad by the ancient churchmen or religious men at the time of the Reformation; for, excepting a part of the records of Glasgo, with the two chartularies, saved by the Archbishop James Beaton, it was never as yet heard that any of our countrymen have met with anything considerable of that kind in any foreign country. Though within these last hundred years and upwards, since the truth of our antiquities,

as set down by Boece, hath been violently contested, and many other warm disputes betwixt the Scots and the Irish, several of the most learned of our countrymen have used all possible diligence in searching everywhere abroad after all remains of our history or antiquities. Such were Thomas Dempstar, so famous for his contests and debates with the Irish ; George Conne, a Roman prelate ; David Chambers, and others, all of them in great credit at Rome and elsewhere abroad. We have had others that have searched through Flanders and Germany ; and of late the learned Dr. John Jamesone, who lived many years in Rome, and had access to all their libraries, and searched with zeal everywhere, both in Italy and France, yet never could hear of any considerable monument concerning Scotland, except what everybody knows of the above-mentioned charters or writs of the church of Glasgo at Paris, and a history of the abbots of Kinlos in Murray, written by Fererius Pedemontanus, the continuator of Boece's history. Others of late have made further searches abroad in the same view. So that there appears no other ground for that story of the transportation of ancient Scotish histories or other monuments, but the care and zeal of the aforesaid Archbishop of Glasgo to save what he could of those of his church from the common fate of all the rest. It had been indeed to be wished that his example had been followed by other prelates, churchmen, or religious men of those times ; but by all that hath yet been discovered, there is little or no appearance that he had any considerable imitators. Besides that, it must be considered that this violent burning and destroying all churches, with their records and monuments, came on so suddenly, as we have observed, and was carried on with so great impetuosity, that those among the churchmen or religious men who remained firm in the old religion had difficulty to provide for their own safety, and were not in a condition to save anything else.

After this melancholy relation of the destruction of historical and of all kind of ancient monuments at our Reformation, which fell heaviest on those that concerned the church, it remains now to give some short account of such ancient pieces that escaped the zeal of those times. And, in the first place, some of the *Scotichronicons* and other historical pieces were saved by some curious men, lovers of the honour of their country, into whose hands they happened to fall when all was going to wreck. It was also by the same means that some of the chartularies of four of the cathedral churches (besides the two of Glasgo saved by the Archbishop James Beaton) were preserved ; to wit, those of St. Andrews, of Murray, of Aberdeen, and of Brechin. But the chartularies of the other eight

cathedrals, together with the original writs or charters, records, and registers of all of them, perished in the manner that Spotswood¹ hath related.

But it appears that no kind of monuments had so good a luck to escape as many of the chartularies of the abbeys; and there were particular motives for saving of them, preferably to any other monuments of ecclesiastical antiquities. For almost the only pieces, I may say in general all that they contain, are the authentic copies of the temporal lands, possessions, and jurisdictions that anciently belonged to these religious houses or churches whose chartularies they are; such as the bulls, charters, or writs of their foundations, donations, confirmations, etc., by the popes, kings, bishops, nobility, etc.

Now it is to be observed that the first preachers of our Scottish Reformation had carried to that height their invectives against the old churchmen and religious men of those times, and against the riches and possessions of churches and convents (towards which, to speak the truth, the abuses of those times furnished them too great a handle), that they condemned all the ancient foundations and donations of lands and revennes made to churches or convents as sinful, and as being given towards superstitious uses, and therefore to be reformed away. On the other hand, in their declamations against the avarice of churchmen in performing their functions, to render them more odious to the people, they themselves in the beginning spoke the language of men who aimed at no worldly settlement, but purely at the glory of God and salvation of souls; and as they gave themselves out for men extraordinarily raised up to re-establish the doctrine of the apostles and apostolical men, so the people were at first made to believe that these new preachers would equally imitate the apostles and their disciples in looking no farther than their daily bread, and depending entirely on Providence for their subsistence; this gained over to them numbers of people. And this cant lasted till the assembly held in August 1560, called by that party a Parliament, in which the first Acts were made against the old religion and in favour of the Reformation. And from thenceforth the preachers changed their note, and they began immediately to cry for stipends, and in proportion as their credit was established to lay claim to the old church lands and possessions, as sacred things given irrevocably to God, and which could not be lawfully dispossed but for settling of the ministers,² or to charitable

¹ *Supra*, p. 312.

² See Knox's Hist. edit. in fol. pp. 319, 320, 325, 326, 339, 349, etc., and the Acts of the first General Assembly, December 1560, and the following Assemblies.

uses at their disposal. But in this they were overruled by more powerful pretenders.

For many of the nobility and gentry over the kingdom that had embraced the Reformation had heard and received, with no less pleasure, the instructions of the first preachers of it concerning the abuse and misapplication of so much riches, and so many temporal lands and baronies disposed to abbeys and churches for uses which, they had been informed, were superstitious. And being thus easily persuaded that all these foundations and donations of churches and convents were null, and of no effect from the beginning, and, by consequence, that they reverted in course to the sovereign, to the nobility, or to the heirs of the first founders and donors,—upon this, some of those among them that had been the most zealous promoters of the work of the Reformation were among the first to get into the possession of the temporals of the abbeys and churches, partly as having been, by a mistaken zeal, lavished away by their predecessors to bad uses, partly by obtaining a gift, and generally, for greater security, a confirmation of them from the sovereign, to whom they supposed they were by right returned, as to the chief founder. And Queen Mary, to be able to enjoy some freedom, peace, and quietness amidst the disaffected and divided parties she found in the kingdom at her return from France, was liberal enough to them all in her concessions and grants of church lands.

Now the original writs or charters of the foundations and donations of the lands of the abbeys and churches having been for the most part destroyed over the kingdom, together with the religious houses and churches themselves, as we have seen, and the only remaining authentic copies or duplicates of all these writs being contained in the chartularies of those abbeys or churches, those chartularies came to be in esteem, were carefully sought among the spoils of those religious houses, and saved chiefly by those that had obtained the possession of their temporality, as containing a kind of progress of writs, or as being so many authentic land-books, in which an exact indication and enumeration of all that had belonged to these abbeys and churches was to be found. And thus so many of them are still remaining; for there being generally several copies of the chartularies of each abbey, some of them escaped the common fate, and were easily to be found in those days.

There are still remaining a sufficient number of them, which, if put together and printed, would make at least one large volume of a *Monasticon Scoticum*, and be of great use towards the illustration of the ancient families of the nobility and gentry of that kingdom, especially during the twelfth, thirteenth, and

fourteenth age ; and that is now the chief or only use of them, for they serve very little towards giving light into the affairs of the church, most part of all that they contain being writs of foundations, donations, and other rights of the temporal lands of the churches and abbeys. However, they being very curious and useful towards giving light into ancient families, in order to preserve them, many of them have been of late acquired by the honourable and learned gentlemen of the Faculty of Advocates at Edinburgh, who, out of zeal for their country, have spared no expense to buy up, at any rate, and preserve from perishing, those and many other precious remains of the history and antiquities of Scotland, and placed them in their library, consisting of a great collection of printed books, all which, for the improvement of learning in their country, they have generously ordered to be open to all learned and curious men.

But no private family hath shown greater zeal for retrieving the historical and other ancient monuments of their country than that of Panmure, which, besides an ancient *Scotichronicon*, is in possession of the original chartularies of St. Andrews and of Brechin, and of copies of almost all the other chartularies remaining, with a rare collection of many original writs of the abbeys and other valuable monuments ; all which the present chief of that noble family was pleased to communicate to me, with singular marks of kindness, during the time I stayed at Edinburgh.

Had there been, in the days of the Reformation (when so many precious monuments of our antiquities were daily perishing, or put to sale for waste paper or parchment), men of such a public spirit as these, and as zealous for the honour of our country, in that case, instead of this long and lamentable enumeration of the loss of ancient monuments that our country made in those times of confusion, I should have had the pleasure to have had to set down here a detailed account or catalogue of the many valuable MSS. of our civil and ecclesiastical history still preserved ; and, among others, of the acts and canons of our national councils, whereof we have now remaining only the dates of a few of them, which, as I promised before, I shall here subjoin, both as a further proof of the loss that our antiquities have sustained from blind zealots, and to confirm what I have here advanced, that the few remains we have now of ancient monuments is no argument that we had not, before the Reformation, as many in proportion as our neighbours ; and in order also towards the furnishing materials for an ecclesiastical history of Scotland, to excite the learned among our countrymen to make further inquiry for anything

of this kind that may still remain undiscovered and unknown in private hands, as that precious collection of canons in the chartulary of Aberdeen, in the Advocates' Library, had done for so many years, till they discovered and bought it up. For the canons and regulations of national or provincial councils are so essential an ingredient in the ecclesiastical history of any country, that without some account of them it must needs appear almost a skeleton.

A Chronological Index of such of the National Councils of the Church of Scotland as I have found mentioned in History and Records.

I. The first of this kind that I find recorded in history was under the reign of King Keneth MacAlpin, about the year of our Lord 850. Among these laws, which Fordun¹ calls *Leges Macalpinae*, as they are set down by Boece,² there are some statutes concerning ecclesiastical matters, which were no doubt made in an assembly with the concurrence of the bishops, as it was the universal discipline of the church in those times that no ecclesiastical laws could be enacted without episcopal authority and concurrence. And though we have now no further accounts of these laws than what the two above-mentioned writers and Winton contain, it cannot be reasonably doubted of but that this victorious king would not fail, upon the union of the Pictish and Scottish kingdoms, after the confusions of war were over, to make new laws for his united kingdoms, proper to heal all intestine dissords. It is most likely that these laws were made at Scoon, where King Keneth had settled the chief seat of his united kingdoms.

II. We have a more certain account of another council or assembly, holden also at Scoon,³ the sixth year of the reign of our King Constantin, son of Eth (A.D. 906), in which this King Constantin and Kellach the bishop, with the Scots, solemnly vowed to observe the laws and discipline of faith, the rights of the churches, and of the gospel, on a little hill, called from thence *Collis credulitatis* (*Knoe-ereidimh*, I suppose, in the

¹ Fordun, lib. 4, c. 8, p. 293, edit. Hearn.

² Boeth. Hist. fol. 208, 1st edit.

³ 'In vi. anno (regni sui) Constantinus rex [filius Edii] & Kellachus episcopus leges disciplinasque fidei, atque jura ecclesiarum, evangeliorumque pariter cum Scottis in colle credulitatis prope regali civitate Scoan (sic) devoverunt custodiri: ab hoc die collis hoc [nomen] meruit, i.e. collis credulitatis.' — *Vide Append. No. 3.*

vulgar language), 'near the royal city of Scoon.' It is like it was the same place so famous afterwards by the name of the Mute-Hill of Scoon; in Latin, *Omnis terra*.—*Vide Skein's Glossary*.

III. During the reign of Malcolm Keanmore, about A.D. 1073 or 1074, several national councils were held in Scotland by the pious zeal of his royal consort, St. Margaret, as Turgot² (who, it is like, assisted himself at these councils) relates in her life, for the re-establishing ecclesiastical discipline, and the reformation of manners. Some extracts of the canons of these councils are set down by Turgot. But the whole acts and canons at length were no doubt deposited either at Dunfermline, founded in this reign, or at St. Andrews.

IV. A.D. 1126, under the reign of King David I., a council holden at Roxburgh by the cardinal-legate John of Crema.—*Decem Scriptores Angliae*, col. 252.

V. A.D. 1138, in the same reign, another national council of the bishops of Scotland, holden by the legate Alberic at Carlisle, where, in those days, King David kept ordinarily his court.—*Decem Scriptores Angliae*, col. 264.

VI. A.D. 1177, a national council at Edinburgh, holden by the cardinal-legate Winian, with the bishops of Scotland, in which many ancient canons were renewed, and new ones enacted.—*Chron. Maylr. hoc anno & Fordun*, edit. Hearne, p. 714.

VII. A.D. 1201, in December, a national council was holden at Perth by John de Salerno, cardinal-legate, in which many canons were made.—*Chr. Maylr. Houeden*. p. 468, etc.

VIII. A.D. 1206, a national council (called in the original writ *Synodus Generalis*), holden at Perth in April.—*Ex Charta penes Vicecomitem de Arbuthnot*.

IX. A.D. 1211, a national council holden at Perth by William, Bishop of St. Andrews, Walter, Bishop of Glasgo, and the other bishops of Scotland.—*Scotichron. Paslaten. in Biblioth. Regia Londin.* lib. ix. c. 78.

X. A.D. 1221, James, canon of St. Victor at Paris, penitentiary of the Pope, and legate to Scotland, held a national council of all the prelates of Scotland at Perth, during four days in the month of February.—*Scotichron. idem*, lib. ix. c. 37.

A.D. 1225, a mandate of Pope Honorius III., the 19th of May, the ninth of his pontificate, to all the bishops of Scotland; by which, after having told them that, whereas he had been informed by some of them, that for want of a metropolitan, by whose authority they might regularly hold provincial councils, the canons were not duly observed, and many other abuses

¹ Vita S. Margaretæ reginæ in actis sanctor. Boland. ad 10 Jun.

happened, therefore he enjoins them, that since they had not a metropolitan, they should convene, by his authority, to celebrate provincial councils, which, says the pope, ought not to be omitted.—*Ex Chartular. vet. Moravien. fol. 11, & Chartular. Aberdon. fol. 25, in Biblioth. Jurid. Edinb.*

XI. In consequence of this mandate, and upon receiving it, the bishops held a national or provincial council¹ of all the prelates of the kingdom, in which they regulated the form of holding it; and enacted, 1st. That according to the canons² of the church, a provincial council should be holden every year, at which all the bishops, abbots, and priors should assist, to regulate all ecclesiastical affairs. 2d. That at each council³ a conservator, being one of the bishops, should be chosen by common consent to preside instead of a metropolitan; and who, in that quality, should punish all transgressors of the statutes of the councils, and by the authority of the same. 3d. That at each council⁴ the bishops should preach by turns, beginning by the Bishop of St. Andrews, etc.

XII. In the chartulary of Murray we have an account of another national council, indicted to be holden⁵ *in domo fratrum prædicatorum de Perth*, on Wednesday before the feast of St. Luke, in October, but without the date of the year; only it must have been some years after A.D. 1230, when the Blackfriars first came into Scotland. However, in this act we have the form of the bishop conservator, his indicting or convocating the yearly council, *authoritate conservatoria*, as the act bears, by a letter to each bishop, charging him to give his presence at such a place (which was commonly the convent of the Blackfriars of Perth), on such a day, with continuation of days, together with the abbots and priors, the proctors of chapters, colleges, and convents of his diocese; there to treat of the reformation of the state of the church, etc.

I call all these councils national, because they were composed of the bishops, prelates, proctors of the chapters, and of all the clergy of the kingdom, though in the precise language of the canon law these councils, being held by the bishop conservator, instead of a metropolitan, and so by an archiepiscopal authority, according to the pope's mandate, they are called by the pope and by the bishops themselves provincial councils; and by our Parliaments, general or general-provincial councils.

XIII. A.D. 1239, the cardinal-legate Otho, having at last obtained leave of King Alexander II. (who,⁶ two years before,

¹ Statuta generalia ecclesiæ Scoticanæ, can. 1, in Chartul. Aberd. *supra.*

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. can. 2.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Chartul. vet. Moravien. fol. 93, in Bibl. Jurid. Ed.

⁶ Matth. Paris, p. 301.

had absolutely refused to suffer any legate to enter his kingdom), came into Scotland about the end of September, held a national council at Edinburgh the 19th day of October, and departed in the beginning of November.—*Scotichr. Paslat.* lib. ix. c. 54.

XIV. A.D. 1242, a national council held at Perth.—*Scotichr. Paslat.* lib. ix. c. 59.

XV. A.D. 1268, Othobon, cardinal-legate in England, cited the bishops of Scotland to a council, which he was to hold in England; two of them went as deputies from the rest, but refused to accept of the canons of his council; and being returned home, they, with all the rest of the bishops and clergy of Scotland, held a national council of their own in their usual manner at Perth.—*Scotichr.* lib. x. c. 25.

XVI. A.D. 1273, a national council at Perth.—*Scotichr.* lib. x. c. 33.

XVII. A.D. 1275, a national council at Perth, in presence of Bagimond, the pope's nuncio, who came to collect the taxations of all benefices, and settled a roll of those taxations that served for a rule in following times, to which our Acts of Parliament refer.¹—*Scotichr.* lib. x. c. 35.

XVIII. A.D. 1280, a national council holden at the Blackfriars of Perth, on Monday after St. Bartholomew's Day in August; mentioned in a sentence of Archibald, Bishop of Murray this year.—*Chartular. vct. Eccl. Moravien.* fol. 46, in *Bibl. Jurid. Edin.*

XIX. A.D. 1310, a national council holden at Dundee, in which, among other acts, King Robert I.'s right to the crown is asserted by all the bishops and clergy of Scotland.—*Independency*, by M. Anderson, append. No. 12.

XX. A.D. 1321, a national council holden at Perth in July, mentioned in the rolls of King Robert I., n. 85.—*Ex Collect. Comitis de Panmure*, p. 65.

XXI. A.D. 1324, a national council holden in March at Scoon; it is called in the Act, *Generale Concilium*. Mentioned in a writ in the chartulary of Glasgo of this year.

XXII. A.D. 1420, a national council holden the 16th of July, at the Blackfriars of Perth, by William, Bishop of Dunblain, conservator, and in that quality president of the council. There is an Act of this council concerning the *quotes* of testament; but the Act is more considerable because it describes the form of the council, which is there called *Synodus Provincialis & Concilium Generale Cleri Regni Scotiae*, with the names of the bishops present in person or by procurator, etc. Among other things, it appears that the decrees or statutes were sealed by all

¹ Jam. III. parl. 6, c. 44; Jam. IV. parl. 4, c. 39.

the bishops' seals. This Act is in the original chartulary of Brechin, *pcnes Comitem de Panmure*, fol. 62.

XXIII. A.D. 1457, a national council at Perth, in which, among other Acts, a declaration was made concerning the king's right of nomination to benefices during vacancies of bishoprics, etc.—*Records of Parliament of King James III.* fol. 75.

XXIV. A.D. 1459, a national council holden in July, at Perth, by Thomas, Bishop of Aberdeen, conservator, and in that quality president of the council, in which the aforesaid declaration was renewed.—*Records of Parliament, as above.*

XXV. A.D. 1487. I find, in a chartulary of Arbroath, a deputation made by the abbot and convent of that abbey, of procurators to assist at a general or national council, to be holden this year at St. Andrews.—*Chartular. maj. Aberbroth.* fol. 115, in *Bibl. Jurid. Edinb.*

XXVI. A.D. 1512, a national council holden at Edinburgh.—Mentioned by Bishop Lesly in his *History of Scotland*, p. 356.

XXVII. A.D. 1536, a national, or, as it is called in the Act, a general provincial council of Scotland, to be holden the 1st day of March next to come, 1536, in the Blackfriars at Edinburgh, by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, ordered by Act of Parliament in January 1535.—*Records of Parliament of King James v.* fol. 8.

XXVIII. A.D. 1546, a national council holden at Edinburgh, by Cardinal Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and primate, for the reformation of the lives and manners of churchmen.—*Buchanan's Hist.* lib. 15.

XXIX. A.D. 1549, a national council begun at Lithgo in August, and transferred in September to Edinburgh, holden by John Hamilton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, and primate, for reformation of the ecclesiastical discipline.

XXX. A.D. 1552, a national council holden at Edinburgh, in January, by the same archbishop. It was in this council that the large catechism, printed at St. Andrews in August following by this archbishop's order, was approved.—*Lesl. Hist.* p. 476.

XXXI. A.D. 1559, the last national council of Scotland, holden at Edinburgh in March, by the same archbishop, for reformation of ecclesiastical discipline.—*Lesl. Hist.* pp. 504, 505.

These are the dates of such of the national councils of Scotland as I have hitherto had occasion to observe in records or history; and though their number may appear not inconsiderable to those who, by reason of the universal destruction of ecclesiastical acts and monuments within that kingdom, may have imagined that those canonical assemblies had been extremely rare in our country, yet we have assured proof of

these thirty-one councils, which, I have remarked, are almost nothing in comparison of the great number of such national assemblies that were holden in former ages; since it was solemnly enacted,¹ about five hundred years ago, by the whole bishops and clergy assembled in council, according to the example of their predecessors, that a national or provincial council should be holden every year, convocated by the bishop conservator for the time, at which all the clergy of the kingdom were to convene by themselves or by deputies, under pain of being proceeded against for their absence, etc.

It is easy to judge by this, that if the acts and canons of all these councils, which, as we see, were yearly to be assembled, had been preserved entire, such as they were before the Reformation, we might have had this day not only two such as Spelman's, but many volumes of national councils of Scotland, besides so many other valuable ecclesiastical acts and monuments of all kinds, which had been proper materials for a history of the ancient church of that kingdom, which, being now deprived of such proper vouchers, can never come up to make a figure like to those of other nations.

But to conclude this melancholy subject, at least I hope that no reasonable man, after considering all that hath been said in this article, will henceforth, from the scarcity of civil and ecclesiastical monuments under which the Scots at present labour, conclude that there must have been fewer of both kinds of those monuments in past ages in Scotland, in proportion to its extent, than in other civilised and Christian countries.

ART. III.—*An Account of the Monuments, Writers, and Records of the Scottish History that yet remain.*

I am now to give an account of the few historical pieces of our country which, after all the disasters above mentioned, still remain, especially of those that are more ancient and less known; and in this account I shall endeavour to follow the

¹ ‘Auctoritate Dei omnipotentis & sacerorum canonum, ac sacro sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiae, nos prelati ecclesiae Scoticanæ concilium provinciale nostrorum prædecessorum more celebrantes, & laudibilem consuetudinem observantes, unanimi consensu statuimus & ordinamus ut SINGULIS ANNIS singuli episcopi & abbates ac prioratum priores in habitu solemni ad concilium celebrandum ad certum diem, per conservatorem concilii sibi competenter præfigendum, devotè convenient, ut per triduum, si necesse fuerit, in eodem concilio valeant pro necessitatibus divinis & ecclesiasticis commorari, & invocata spiritus sancti gratia statum ecclesiasticum ibidem ad modum debitum & placentem Deo reformatum. Si quis vero eorum canonica præpeditione fuerit impeditus, procuratorem vice sua sufficientem substituat. Non autem veniens personaliter, cum venire posset, & noluerit, auctoritate concilii & arbitrio puniatur.’—*Ex Statutis Generalibus Ecclesiae Scoticanæ, can. 1. In Chartular. vet. Aberdon., in Biblioth. Jurid. Edinb.*

order of the time in which these pieces seem to have been written, and the various epochs of our history which they respect.

But, to avoid useless repetitions, the learned Dr. William Nicholson, late Bishop of Londonderry, having published an exact and impartial account of the Scottish historians, especially from Fordun downwards, and the late Dr. Mackenzie having also treated, at great length, of the Scottish writers in general, I shall not insist upon a subject which these learned gentlemen have so lately handled, but endeavour only to supply what may not have come under their consideration, and shall confine myself to give an account of some short pieces relating to the Scottish history which are less known, or have been less taken notice of by those that have treated the subject before, and chiefly give a more particular account of those pieces that may give more light into the point I am about to examine ; to wit, the time of the settlement of the Scots, and of the beginning of their monarchy in Britain.

In treating this subject I shall reduce all that remains of the domestic monuments of history that have come to my knowledge to four heads or classes. First class : remains of the ancient Scottish history antecedent to the year 1291. Second class : records or monuments of our ancient history written betwixt the year 1291 and the publishing of John Fordun's history, about the year 1447. Third class : of John Fordun's history, his continuators, followers, and other writers of our history, till the year 1526, in which Boece's history came out. Fourth class : of the histories of Hector Boece, Buchanan, and their followers.

SEC. I.—*Containing such Remains as we have of our Ancient History written before the year 1291.*

It is not to be wondered at that the remains we have of our ancient history, written before the year 1291, are very few and lame, since, besides the disasters which happened in King Edward I.'s time, our posterior writers, with a view to make up that loss, having framed to themselves, as will afterwards appear, new schemes of our history very different from our more ancient writers, it could not be expected that great care would be taken of the remains of these ancient chronicles that did not agree with these new drafts of our history. So, at best, such of our old chronicles or other historical monuments which had escaped the searches in King Edward's time, lay in the obscurity of some corner of the libraries of our churches and monasteries, with many other valuable ancient monuments, oft-

times unknown to their possessors, till the zeal of our new reformers burnt down and destroyed the churches and abbeys, with their libraries and all that they contained, which had been till those times preserved.

Some of these which I am here to account for are remains of that kind ; and though they are all very short, yet, being written before the year 1291, whilst our old annals were as yet subsisting, and so being extracted from or conformable to them, they appear to be the surest guides that we can follow in order to have a true account of the ancient part of our history. The few that I have met with of them will be printed in the appendix to this essay, with some other short ancient pieces relating to Scotland, of all which I shall here give a short account, beginning at these pieces which have been more than once already mentioned.

I. The first piece is a kind of description of Albany, or of Scotland, on the north side of the Friths of Cluyd and Forth ; it bears in the ms. this title : *De situ Albani que in se figuram hominis habet; quomodo fuit primitus in septem regionibus divisa; quibusque nominibus antiquitus sit vocata, & a quibus inhabitata.* This short treatise was written about the twelfth age, as appears by the author's assuring us that he had a part of his information from Andrew, Bishop of Catness, who, according to the chronicle of Maylros, died A.D. 1185.

I think that there is ground to believe that the author of this description was Giraldus Cambrensis, for I remember to have observed somewhere in his works that he promises to give a description of Albany or Scotland ; and Andrew, Bishop of Catness, may have seen him in England in King David I.'s time, or in that of his grandchildren, King Malcolm or King William, for Andrew was already bishop A.D. 1150 (as appears by a writ of the church of Glasgo). Besides this, several passages of this description are to be found, word for word, in Ralph Higden's *Polychronicon*,¹ as being taken from a work of Girald's, which it seems is now lost ; and the terms in which the author speaks of Bishop Andrew,² and some other expressions in this piece, prove that the author of it was no Scotsman. Camden, in his last editions of the description of Scotland, hath given an extract of this piece, having no doubt seen the ms. from whence I copied it in the Lord Burleigh's library. It is the same already mentioned,³ which was bought up by order of M. Colbert, and is now, as I am informed, with the rest of the Colbertin mss. in the king's library at Paris. The three follow-

¹ *Polychron.* edit. Reg. Gale, pp. 185, 209.

² *Andreas natione Scottus.*

³ *Supra*, p. 74.

ing pieces are in the same MS., which also contains some other pieces relating to the history of Britain.

II. The second piece is entitled in the MS., *Chronica de origine antiquorum Pictorum*. I have already given an account of it,¹ and have only to add that there is prefixed to it a kind of preface, composed in part of passages of some British writers, and of Isidor of Seville, which seems not to answer the title of the piece in this preface, giving little or no true light into the origin of the Picts; and it is so incorrectly written, that it is hard enough to make sense of some parts of it. What is truly valuable is the body of the piece, being a chronicle, as it is called, or a catalogue of the seventy Pictish kings, from Cruithne to Constantin, with the rest of them, down to the union of the Pictish and Scotish kingdoms; and the last part of it, as it hath been already observed, is the exactest account of the succession of the Pictish kings that is extant.

III. The third piece is an extract of an ancient history or chronicle of eleven of the kings of Scotland, containing their succession, and a short account of their lives and chief actions, from the subjection of the Picts by King Keneth MacAlpin till the reign of King Keneth III., son to Malcolm I., during the space of about one hundred and thirty years. The only copy I have seen of this short chronicle is taken from the same MS. as the former, whence also Camden hath quoted some passages. The history or chronicle from whence it hath been extracted appears evidently to have been originally written in the Gaelic or Irish language; and the mention that it makes of the succession and deaths of some kings of Ireland, as also some particulars that it contains (such as the confused manner in which it relates King Gregory's reign), all this makes me doubt whether it be not rather an extract of Scotish matters from some Irish chronicle than from a Scotish one. The Latin version, such as we have it in this only MS., is most barbarous, and every way imperfect, and written by an ignorant transcriber that hath not known the Latin tongue, and by consequence is so incorrect that in some places no sense can be made of it. However, the piece containing some particulars of the Scotish history which are not to be met with in our common writers, and some remarkable passages, I shall give it, such as it is, entire in the appendix.²

It was from this abstract that Camden had the famous passage, ‘In hujus [Indulfi Regis] tempore oppidum Eden evacuatum est, ac relictum est Scottis usque in hodiernum diem.’ This passage was quoted from Camden first by Bishop Usher, and after them by some other English and Irish writers, to

¹ *Supra*, p. 74.

² Append. No. 3.

endeavour to prove that the Saxons were in possession of Lothian till King Indulf's time, about the middle of the tenth age. But besides that, we have an account from Giraldus Cambrensis,¹ no friend to the Scots, and from other authors (probably as ancient as this anonymous writer), of whom Ranulfus Cestrensis gives us extracts in his *Polychronicon*, that King Keneth MacAlpin, about one hundred years before this, was master of all the territories from the friths to the Tweed ; that he had vanquished the Saxons six times. This same anonymous piece informs us also that King Keneth attacked the Saxons six times, that he possessed himself of Maylros and Dunbar, and relates other advantages that our kings, predecessors to Indulf, had over the Saxons. So the most that can be made of this passage is, that the town Eden, or Edinburgh, had been taken from the Scots after King Kenneth's time, and was rendered back to them in King Indulf's time. And, after all, we know nothing certain about the epoch nor of the authority of this extract.

I come now to give account of some other ancient pieces which have immediate relation to the question I am about to examine. They are written by Scotish authors, or rather extracted from our ancient Scotish annals before the year 1291, when, as our historians relate, most of these annals perished in King Edward I.'s time.

IV. The first, which is the fourth in the appendix, is entitled, in the same ms. above mentioned, *Cronica Regum Scotorum ccxxv. annorum*. It contains the series or names of our kings, with their lineal descent, and the years of their reigns, from King Fergus, son of Erch, till King William in the twelfth age, in whose time it was written or extracted, as appears by its ending precisely at the first year of his reign and with his genealogy, which it carries up, as all the others of this kind do, to Noah. This genealogical series is entirely conformable to that which is contained in all our Scotish writers already mentioned,² before the new genealogy given by Boece appeared. From Malcolm Keanmore down to King William, this gives some particulars of the lives of our kings and of their children ; and it gives ground to conjecture that the author of it was a monk of Maylros, or had some relation to that abbey. The date of *ccxxv. annorum*, at the end of the title of this small chronicle, seems to respect either the number of years from the beginning of King Fergus Mac Erch to the union of the Pictish and Scotish monarchy, or from this union to the first year of King William's reign.

¹ *Polychron.* edit. Galas. pp. 194, 209, 210.

² *Supra*, pp. 141, 142.

V. The fifth ancient piece in the appendix is another chronological series of the kings of Scots, with their descent and years of their reigns, from Fergus, the son of Erch. It ends the third year of King Alexander III., A.D. 1251. There is inserted in it a catalogue of the Pictish kings. This series is taken from one of the most ancient and most authentic historical monuments of Scotland, the register of the priory of St. Andrews, fol. 46. It was sent to me some years ago, with some other extracts of that register or chartulary, by the late Sir Robert Sybbald, M.D., a most zealous person for collecting all ancient monuments of the Scotish history that he could find. It is worth remarking, 1st, that Sir Robert sent me along with it this caution or advice, to wit, that it was of little or no use to prove the antiquity of the Scotish monarchy ; meaning that it could not serve to prove the scheme of our monarchy as set down by H. Boece and our other later historians, of which Sir Robert was very full. 2d. It is no less to be remarked that this catalogue itself, being registered among the records and charters of that ancient church, is a full proof of its being held authentic at the time it was written, that is, A.D. 1251, whilst our ancient annals and monuments of history were yet in being, and forty years before the searches made in King Edward's time.

The certainty of the succession of our kings contained in this register is confirmed by the account we have of them from Winton, and from James Gray, who both of them had their information from the same records of St. Andrews, as we shall have occasion to observe more at length afterwards. It was from the extracts of this register of St. Andrews that the passages set down in Sir James Dalrymple's collections were extracted; and with the extracts sent to me by Sir Robert Sybbald, the folio of the register was marked whence each extract was taken. As every great church had several of these chartularies or registers, this register of St. Andrews was different from another valuable one already mentioned,¹ in which these catalogues of our kings are not set down, as not belonging to the subject, which concerns only the temporal lands and rights of that church.

In this series or catalogue of our kings contained in this register of St. Andrews, from Keneth MacAlpin downward, there is a short account of the death and burial-place and of some of the actions of our kings; and this last part of the series is entirely the same, word for word, with another chronological account of our kings from Keneth MacAlpin, contained in a ms. of the Cotton Library (Vitellius, A. 20). It is also conformable to another chronological account of the same kings,

¹ Penes Com. de Panmure.

in verse, and printed at the end of Melross' chronicle. Now this conformity of several ancient accounts of our kings, written by different hands, and preserved in different places, proves the account of them to be true, because they agree one with another.

VI. A sixth piece is a short Latin chronicle, in verse or rhyme, subjoined to most of the copies of the *Scotichronicon*. There is an entire copy of it at the end of the *Scotichron.* MS. *Colleg. Scot. Paris.*, without those interpolations which are in some other copies. This chronicle gives a very different account, both of the beginning of the Scottish monarchy and of the succession of the first kings, from the chronicle of John Fordun; and in every thing it differs from him it agrees as to the names and number of kings with the fourth and fifth chronological series of our kings which I have already mentioned. It consists of eleven chapters; and though at first it would appear to be one continued piece, it is really composed of at least two distinct parts, written in different ages, as the preface to it insinuates, and the tenor of the poem proves,—the first part being written *veteri metro*, in ancient metre or verse, as the preface calls it, and the last parts in new verse of the same sort of metre: & *novo ad propositum respondente*.

The first part, consisting of eight chapters, was written in Alexander II. or III.'s time; for the author, after relating King William's death, before he speaks of his son Alexander II., begins the ninth chapter with these words:

‘ Hactenus hæc dicta novi per chronica scripta
A modo quo novi scriptis describere vovi.’

So all this part of the chronicle was composed whilst our old annals as yet subsisted—that is, before the year 1291.

The last part was composed about the year 1448, by a new hand, in order to bring down the succession to the time of King James II., who then reigned.

In general, the first three chapters of this chronological poem contain a rude draft of the vulgar traditions of the Scots in those times concerning their remote antiquities,—their coming from Egypt to Spain, from thence to Ireland, and so to Albany. The fourth chapter gives some account of the Pictish monarchy in Albany. The fifth mentions the beginning of the Scottish monarchy in Albany. The sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters give the series of the kings from Fergus, son of Erch, till the death of King William, with the years of each reign. The ninth and tenth chapters contain the succession of our kings from King William's death till the reign of King Robert the Bruce. The eleventh chapter brings down the series from

Robert the Bruce till King James II., who, the author of this last addition says, was seventeen years of age when he composed it, which answers to the year 1448.

Besides these six ancient pieces, which will be found in the appendix, there are some few other monuments of the Scottish history in posterior times, already published, which also were written before A.D. 1291; such as the *Chronicle of Maylros*, which ends A.D. 1270. But the series of our kings contained in it reaches no higher up than the year 731, where Bede left off his history, and where his chronicle begins; and even this series of our kings (which begins only at the death of King Ewan in the eighth age) is not of the first hand, in which the rest of the ms. of the chronicle in the Cotton Library is written, as the learned editor hath remarked, but of a later hand, and inserted very negligently and incorrectly, especially as to the chronology. The first author of this chronicle is all English, and gives but short hints of Scottish matters till the time of King Alexander I. and King David I., except one leaf, which in the original ms. is of a hand about one hundred years more ancient than that of the chronicle itself. This leaf is abruptly inserted in the original ms., and interrupts the thread of the chronology, as may be seen, p. 158, lib. 27, of the printed copy, where this leaf begins: ‘Malcolmus filius Dunecan suscepit regnum Scotiae jure haereditario,’ etc. This old writ ends p. 159, lib. 3, with the death of King Malcolm IV., A.D. 1165, when it was written.

The chronicle itself contains a good series of Scottish affairs, from the time of the second foundation or restoration of Maylros, A.D. 1136, by S. David R. I.

The title of the chronicle in the printed edition, where it is said, *inchoata per abbatem de Dundraynan*, is a wrong reading of the word *inchoavit*, instead of *mutuavit abbas de Dundraynan* in the original, in a character of a later hand. Our country is obliged to the late Dr. Gale for the edition of this chronicle, which is in the first volume of the XV. *Scriptores Angliae*, and to him likewise for the first edition of *Fordun* in the second volume.

Another very short chronicle, written in King Malcolm IV. or King William's time, is printed in the *Anglia Saera*, and entitled *Chronicon S. Crucis de Edynburgh*; but it contains little of Scottish matters till King David I.'s time.

Another piece of our history, written before the year 1291, is a poem in Latin, containing the elegies or epitaphs of our kings; being a short account of their lives and deaths, from Kenneth, the first monarch of all Scotland or Albany. It is inserted by a later hand in the ms. of Maylros chronicle in the

Cotton Library, and published alone by itself, at the end of the printed edition. This copy comes no farther down than the death of King Malcolm iv. But there is another copy of it in a ms. of the Bodleian Library, that brings the succession down to the beginning of the reign of Alexander III., at which time it was written, as is clear from the last verses of it :

‘ALEXANDER III.

‘Nomen habet patris, utinam patris acta sequatur.
Filius Albanica qui modo sceptra tenet.’

These are all the remains that I have as yet met with of Scotish chronicles or history written before the year 1291. I do not mention here the remains of our ecclesiastical monuments, these not belonging properly to this first essay ; but an account of some of them hath been already occasionally given¹ in this essay.

SEC. II.—*Of Records or Monuments of our Ancient History, written since the year 1291, and before the publishing of Fordun's Chronicle.*

Although we had no other proofs of the loss of our histories and records in the year 1291, and of the ignorance of the ancient state of the Scots in Britain which ensued upon that loss, it would but too evidently appear by the uncertainty in which our countrymen were at that time, and the contradictory accounts they give of the state of the north of Britain in ancient times ; and those not barely private writers, but men of the best figure, selected on purpose to defend the cause of the whole kingdom in one of the most solemn debates that we ever had, and that before the pope ; in a word, the whole body of the nation, bishops, nobles, and commons, in their memorials and letters upon this occasion. There are yet remaining three public pieces, presented to the pope in the name of the Scotish nation, in which the sentiments that they had in that age of their antiquities, profane and sacred, do appear.

To understand the subject of those pieces, it is necessary to observe that, upon King Edward I.'s claiming the superiority of Scotland, and invading the kingdom, the Scots had recourse to the pope, Boniface VIII., and sent to Rome three procurators—to wit, William, archdean of Lothians,² Baldred Bisset, and W. Eglisham, as their deputies, to represent their grievances, and seek remedy, carrying with them such proofs of their freedom and independency as they had yet remaining.

Upon which the pope wrote to King Edward (27th June 1199) monitory letters, by which, supposing Scotland to be a

¹ *Supra*, p. 320, etc.

² *Fordun, Continuat. edit. Hearn.* p. 795.

fief of the see of Rome, and proving the liberty and independency of that kingdom by bulls and charters in King Edward's father Henry III.'s time, and in his own, at the same time the pope summoned King Edward to send procurators to Rome in six months to defend his claim, declaring all he should in the meantime enterprise against Scotland to the contrary, null and of no effect.

King Edward let pass above a year and a half without any answer, and then being pressed, caused first his nobles (12th February 1301)¹ to answer, that Scotland was not a fief of the apostolical see, but of England, and that they would not suffer their king to answer or send procurators to Rome upon this debate, etc. At last Edward himself answered (7th May 1301),² endeavouring to prove the subjection of the Scots to the English by a long deduction, beginning from Brutus, Albaniactus, etc.

These letters being communicated by the pope's orders to the Scotish agents still at Rome, they sent them to Scotland, to the council of the kingdom, who caused answers to be drawn up in haste (*cum festinatione*), and sent them back to their agents at Rome, with instructions bearing this title: I. ‘Instructiones³ praelatorum, baronum, & consulum Scotiae missæ ad curiam Romanam contra Edwardum regem Angliæ.’

Besides this, Baldred Bisset, one of the chief of these agents, answered Edward's reasons apart by another memorial, with this title: II. ‘Processus⁴ ductus in curia Romana per procuratores regni Scotiae & specialiter per M. Baldredum Biset juris peritum & clericum notabilem contra figmenta regis Angliae.’

Both these pieces may be seen at length in the *Scotichronicon* MS., and in the exact new editions of Fordun by M. Hearne; and both of them, on occasion of King Edward's running up to Brutus, and the other ancient British stories, give us an account of the notion the Scots had then of their own high antiquities, rather by tradition and hearsay than by monuments of history, of which it appears that before this time they had been generally deprived; and in the hurry and confusion matters were in, they had not leisure to consult such remains as they might have of them, for the continuator of Fordun (as I said) remarks that they were drawn up in haste, *cum festinatione*, and the circumstances of the time required expedition.

III. The third piece remaining of these dark times, betwixt the year 1291 and the publishing of Fordun's history, concerning the remote antiquities of the Scots, is the famous

¹ Fordun, Continuat. edit. Hearn. pp. 984, 806.

³ Ibid. p. 835.

² Ibid. p. 809.

⁴ Ibid. p. 883.

letter of the Scotish nobility to Pope John xxii., dated the 6th of August 1320, and often published.¹

Now as to the substance of these three pieces, written betwixt the year 1291 and the publishing the history of John Fordun; in the first place, it must be acknowledged that the liberties and independency of the crown of Scotland from England (which is the main scope of these memorials and letter of the Scots) are maintained with great vigour, and supported with better documents and grounds than could well have been expected in such times, and after the loss the Scots had suffered (as they justly complain) of their ancient monuments, and of the best proofs of their liberties.

As to the accounts they give of their remote antiquities, they are much the same in substance with those given in the *Chronicon Rythmicum*, already mentioned, which contains an abridgment of the traditions of the Scots on that subject, such as they were believed to be commonly in the thirteenth age. But those remote antiquities being only incident matters to the chief subject of the debate of the Scots about their independency on England, they are only occasionally mentioned in the memorials and letter to the pope, not to be behind-hand with King Edward, who had valued himself on his having succeeded by a long descent of kings to Brutus, Locrinus, etc., and as having entered in their rights over the northern inhabitants of Britain. Besides that, the accounts that the Scots deliver in these pieces were drawn up, as hath been remarked, in so great haste that they had not leisure in the hurry of war to examine them maturely, or consult those that were most versed in the antiquities of the nation, but were obliged to set down such notions of them as their memory or popular tradition furnished them with, and at the same time to give them the most favourable turn they could, to the honour and advantage of their nation beyond the English. In a word, those productions of the Scots, I mean as to their remote antiquities, ought to be considered, such as they truly were, as the pleadings of advocates, who commonly make no great difficulty to advance with great assurance all that makes for the advantage of their cause or clients, though they have but probable grounds and sometimes but bare conjectures to go upon.

It must not, then, be wondered at, that we meet with in these productions of the Scots, and others of those times, many particulars concerning our remote antiquities very different

¹ In Dr. Burnet's Collection of Records, in the History of the English Reformation, in M. Anderson's Independency, and in M. Hearne's edition of Fordun, p. 787.

from what more ancient documents contain, and some notions quite new and singular. Now it is to be observed that, though they were only broached in haste, in order to serve the present turn, yet some of these notions having been taken up by posterior writers, and made the foundations of new schemes of our history, it is necessary to give some account of the more singular particulars that those pieces contain.

1st. The instructions of the states insinuate, Scota herself, Pharaoh's daughter, came to Scotland (bringing along with her some of the inhabitants of Ireland as she passed), together with her son Erc; from whose name, and that of his father Gathelus, the first lands that the Scots possessed in Britain were called Argadia, or rather Eregathcyl. 2d. The letter of the nobility insinuates that the Scots came from Spain straight to Britain, without mentioning Ireland. 3d. These pieces tell us that from the first coming of the Scots to Britain, the old name of Albania was changed into that of Scotia (from Scota), which the Scots, say they, thenceforth kept up with an uninterrupted possession of their independency, whilst the south of Britain changed many names and masters. (To be sure, our Highland seanachies were not consulted in this account of the abolishing the name of Albany in those first times, since the Highlanders still retain it to this day.) 4th. As to Christianity, the instructions inform us that the Scots received it four hundred years—Baldred's process says five hundred years—before the English, which would come up to the year one hundred of Christ. And the nobility's letters seemed to say that the Scots embraced Christianity among the first after Christ's resurrection and ascension.

5th. The instructions and process affirm, that in consequence of our Christianity, and afterwards by the famous donation of the Emperor Constantine, Scotland became a fief of the Church of Rome; and they are at great pains to prove, by all the arguments they could think of, their immediate dependence on the see of Rome in temporals; but withal they do not so much as insinuate that ever any of our kings submitted his kingdom to the pope in temporals, as indeed there was never any such thing heard of in Scotland. The truth is that the Scots at this time (*circa* A.D. 1300), being divided among themselves, were grievously oppressed by King Edward, and but faintly assisted by the French; so, expecting no relief from abroad but from the pope and the censures of the church, they make use of all arguments that could move him to exert his power against King Edward; and therefore they plead merit at his hands, by their being a most ancient people, among the first that embraced Christianity, and more yet, by their being

vassals to the pope, from which they inferred that King Edward's claiming superiority over them was a sacrilegious invasion of the rights of the apostolical see, which was therefore more strictly obliged to protect them. In a word, they considered that the pope lying at such a distance from them, their having some dependence on him, even in temporals, was incomparably better and less burthensome than to be vassals to King Edward, so heavy upon them, and so nigh at hand in the same island. Upon the whole, they say all that men in a stress will say to serve a turn, without examining matters so nicely. And for a proof that all this was merely the effect of their present pressures, when those were once over, and King Robert the Bruce's victorious arms had shaken off the English yoke, there is never a word more to be found of the kingdom's being a fief of the Church of Rome in the nobility's letter to Pope John XXII. (A.D. 1320), nor at any time after; but they think it enough to call themselves the humble and devout sons of the pope, and the kingdom and patrimony of St. Andrew, brother to St. Peter, and their special patron; being well assured that none of St. Andrew's successors would claim any vassalage on them.

6th. But the most remarkable thing to be met with in these memorials, and the most material to the subject we are now about, is that in them we find, for the first time in any piece I have yet met with, mention of ancient kings of Scots in Britain before the fifth or sixth age. This became a bottom for posterior writers to work upon. And thus far as to the second class of the monuments of our ancient history.

IV. But before we come to the third class, we have as yet two writers to mention. The one is Andrew Winton, who, though he probably outlived Fordun, yet he wrote before Fordun's chronicle was published, and certainly had never seen his work, and so belongs properly to this second class of the monuments of the Scotish history, written after the year 1291, and before the publishing Fordun's chronicle, which, though written in the reign of King Robert II. or III., was not published till that of King James II.

Andrew Winton was a canon regular of St. Andrews, and prior of Lochleven. He wrote a chronicle in Scotish metre during the end of the reign of King Robert III. and beginning of that of King James I. There are in the register or chartulary of the priory of St. Andrews¹ several authentic acts or public instruments of Andrew Winton, as prior of Lochleven, from the year 1395 till 1413. What precise year he died in I do not find. His work is divided into nine books. The first five

¹ Penes Comitem de Panmure.

contain a kind of abstract of universal history, intermixed with such lame accounts of the Picts and Scots as the author had met with, till the reign of Kenneth MacAlpin in the ninth age. From the sixth book forwards he is more full on the Scottish affairs, and in the three last books he gives almost a continued history of Scottish matters, from Malcolm Keanmore till the beginning of the reign of King James I., where his chronicle ends, about the year 1408.

The character of this writer (as, indeed, of most writers of that age) is to set down with simplicity, and almost without any examination, whatever he found proper to his subject in former writers, or in the common traditions of the times in which he lived, about the matters of which he treats. By consequence, the chief thing we may learn from Winton is what notions the Scots had of their origin, of the beginning of their monarchy, and of the other antiquities of Scots and Picts in the end of the fourteenth age, before the publishing Fordun's chronicle.

As to the Scotish antiquities, Winton, in his first five books, gives us the genealogy of our kings in the different ages, from Noah till Fergus, son of Erch, the same that all our ancient writers before Boece contain. He tells the story of Gathelgas or Gatheyl's marrying Scota, the daughter of Pharaoh, from whom the Scots were so called; his coming to Spain; that Simon Breac, about thirty-three generations from Gathelgas or Gatheyl, and twenty-two from Milesdespain or Milesius, came from Spain to Ireland, and began there the kingdom of the Scots, bringing with him the fatal stone. That the Scots came from Ireland to the north of Britain about four hundred and forty years before the incarnation.

But what is very remarkable, he takes no particular notice of Fergus, son of Feradach, called King Fergus I. by Fordun and his followers, but sets down his bare name, without any mark of distinction, among the other names in that genealogy of our kings. But as to Fergus, the son of Erch, whom he calls Fergus the Great, Winton informs us that it was he who carried over the famous stone from Ireland to the north of Britain, and who became the first king of the Scots in this island, as it will further appear when we come to examine that matter.

Among many other mss. which I have seen of this chronicle of Winton, there is one belonging to the king's library (now joined in with the Cotton library) at London (num. 16, D. xx.) that appears to me the most entire and most valuable of them all. It is written upon strong paper intermixed with vellum from place to place, and, by the form and character of it, seems

to have been written towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, near the author's time. But what is most valuable in this copy is, that it appears to be the last review and edition (if I may speak so) that Winton made of his chronicle, containing several corrections, additions, and alterations made in it upon better information.

The most material addition that this copy¹ contains is a complete chronology or series of the kings of Scots from Fergus, son of Erch, with the years of their reigns, down to Eochad-Rinneval (Mac Dongard-Mac Domnul-Brie, called by our modern writers Eugen. v.) This series is not in another very ancient ms. of this chronicle in the Cotton library,² nor in any other that I have hitherto met with. It is taken from the records of St. Andrews, whereof Winton was a canon, as appears by its conformity to the series in the appendix,³ taken from a register or chartulary of that church, and to that of James Gray, both taken from the same records of that ancient church. This first part of that series in Winton being so rare, I shall give it in his own language with the rest of the pieces in the appendix.⁴ The following part of that series of our kings, which begins Book vi. chap. 1, being intermixed with the rest of the history, and in all the other copies of that chronicle, I shall not follow it.

As to corrections or retrenchments that Winton hath made in this last review of his chronicle, one of the most remarkable is that Winton, it seems, hath been advised by persons more skilled in history, after the first editions of his chronicle appeared, to leave out what he had advanced in the first drafts of it, that Fergus-mac-Erch (whom in all his drafts of it, first and last, he still makes the first king of Scots) began his reign about two hundred and forty years before Cruythne, the first king of the Picts, who, according to him, began only about two hundred years before the incarnation, whereas he had made the reign of Fergus-mac-Erch, first king of the Scots, to begin about four hundred and forty years before the birth of Christ. We may elsewhere have occasion to observe the intricacy into which this drove him; for there being but ten or eleven generations, according to the old genealogy universally received, betwixt Fergus-mac-Erch and Keneth MacAlpin, who lived in the ninth century, the placing Fergus-mac-Erch's reign four hundred years before the incarnation was followed by this absurdity, that ten or twelve generations behoved to extend to twelve centuries. Winton himself had observed⁵

¹ Chron. Winton. Bibliothec. Regiae Lond. book 4, c. 8.

² Bibl. Cotton Nero, D. xi. ³ Append. No. 5. ⁴ Append. No. 7.

⁵ Wint. Chron. fol. 37, 43, etc. Bibl. Cott. Nero, D. xi.

this in the first drafts of his chronicle; and after useless efforts to get rid of it, he is forced at last to leave it to others, or rather to give it up, and to own that the Picts were already reigning in Albany before Fergus-mac-Erch, first king of the Scots, began to reign. It seems that Winton was advised to omit all this in the last review and correction of his chronicle, where accordingly we meet no more with it.

As to Pictish matters, he brings down their settlement and beginning of their monarchy two hundred years later than that of the Scots, as it was usual with all the other Scottish writers to bring it as low as they could, in order to give the Scots a preference of antiquity before the Picts, as it hath been observed;¹ for which reason Winton tells us that the Picts settled in Britain two hundred years only before the incarnation, that their kingdom lasted about one thousand and sixty years, and that they were subdued by Kenneth MacAlpin, A.D. 843. He gives us the names of the Pictish kings, from Cruythane, their first king, much in the same manner as the extract of the register of St. Andrews contains them.

The other writer who belongs to this second class is Mr. James Gray, a public notary, and priest of the diocese of Dunblane. He was a person of character in his time, being successively secretary to the two first archbishops of St. Andrews after Patrick Graham; to wit, to William Schevez, and to Prince James, Duke of Ross, brother to King James IV.

There is extant, in the hands of the learned M. John Kerr, professor of Greek in the Royal College of the old town of Aberdeen, a collection of pieces made by this James Gray for his own use, and fitted to his calling, which M. Kerr was pleased to communicate to me. Among other curious pieces in this collection there is a short chronicle, in which, after setting down a short account of the five first ages of the world, according to the common calculation of those times, there follows, with the title of *Cronica brevis*, in the first place, a genealogy of the kings of Scotland, from Adam down to King James IV., just the same that is given by all other writers that treat of it before the new genealogy produced by Hector Boece appeared. This genealogy inserted by James Gray, as it differs entirely, as well as all the old ones, as we have seen, from that of Boece, so it agrees with all the old ones, except in mistakes and faults of copyists, whereof the chief are that the transcriber, by mistake, takes sometimes the surnames in the genealogy for a new name, and so multiplies by consequence the descents or the generations, by making one descent of the name and another of the surname, thus: instead of

¹ *Supra*, pp. 84, 85, etc.

Eakak or *Eachach Munremore*, *cujus filius fuit Erch*, *cujus filius Fergus*, etc., he has read, *Eakak cuius filius fuit Munre*, *cujus filius fuit Erth more*, etc. At other times, by a contrary mistake, he joins two names or descents in one, thus: instead of *Forgo* or *Fergus*, *cujus filius fuit Maynus*, *cujus filius fuit*, etc., as it is in all other copies of that genealogy, he hath *Forgo Magnus* (reading *g* for *y*, and joining two names) *cujus filius fuit*, etc.

In the next place, James Gray, though he supposes (according to a tradition received among the Scots, as we have seen, from about the twelfth age) that they came to Britain four hundred and forty-three years before the incarnation, and insinuates, as Winton doth, that they had kings from the beginning, or that their kingdom began with their first settlement in Britain, *Notandum quod regnum Scotiae incipit ante incarnationem*, B.C. 443, which was an opinion received among the Scots since the debates before Pope Boniface VIII. against King Edward I. about their independency, as we have seen elsewhere; yet when James Gray comes to set down the series of the kings of Scotland, he follows exactly the extracts of the ancient Scottish chronicles, such as they were long before these debates with King Edward I.; it being manifest, by the text of the chronicle or abstract of our chronicles that James Gray had before him, that it was written during the reign of King William, and before the end of the twelfth age, from these words, where, giving an account of the number of years that the Scots had reigned since the end of the Pictish kingdom, or its union with that of the Scots, he says it was only three hundred and thirty-seven years and five months: *Summa Scotorum post Pictos 337 ann. & 5 mens.* Now, whatever year be assigned to the end of the Pictish monarchy, whether 839, as Fordun reckons, or 842, as it seems more probable, the epoch of the chronicle that James Gray copied will be towards the end of the twelfth age, A.D. 1176 or 1169, during the reign of King William. And this copy of James Gray, bating faults of transcribers, which are many, especially in slipping over some few of the kings' names, and in the numerical ciphers of the years of some reigns, agrees perfectly with the extract already mentioned of the old register of St. Andrews, in the series of the kings of the Scots and Picts, and in the order in which they place them. Both of them begin with these words: 'Fergus filius Erch primus regnavit in Scotia tribus annis ultra Dromalbain, etc.; Dovenghart fil. Fergus quinque annis regnavit; Congal. fil. Dovenghart,' etc., and continue down the succession till King Alpin, of whom they both give the same account in the same words: 'Alpin filius Heoghed annuine 3

annis regnavit. Hic occisus est in Galwathea postquam eam penitus destruxit & devastavit. Ethinc translatum est regnum Scotorum in regnum Pictorum.'

After that, both the register and James Gray set down the catalogue or series of the Pictish kings, beginning both in the same words: 'Cruthnie fil. Kynne clemens judex accepit monarchiam Pictorum & 50 an. regnavit,' etc.; and both finish them in the same manner: 'Drust or Durst, fil. Ferat 3 annis regnavit. Hic occisus est apud Forteviot: secundum alios apud Sconam a Scottis.' And then they both resume the series or catalogue of the Scottish kings, from Keneth Mac-Alpin, in the same words, thus: 'Kinath MacAlpin xvi. ann. regn. super Scotos destructis Pictis & mortuus est in Forteviot & sepultus in Yona insula: ubi tres filii Erch scilicet Fergus, Loarn & Oengus sepulti fuerunt. Hic mira calliditate duxit Scotos de Argadia in terram Pictorum.' From this Kynath or Keneth, the first king after the union, they both carry down the catalogue of the kings of Scotland; to wit, the register of St. Andrews till the second or third year of King Alexander III., about which time it was written, and James Gray till Malcolm Keanmore, where perhaps the chronicle whence he extracted it ended. And after giving a short ecclesiastical kind of chronology, he resumes that of the Scottish kings at Malcolm Keanmore, and carries it down to his own time.

By all this it appears that either James Gray hath copied the register of St. Andrews, or, which is more likely, that both he and the register have followed the same original—that is, the records of St. Andrews, which James Gray had a fair opportunity of doing during his abode several years in that city as secretary to two archbishops, which gave him ready access to all that had been preserved of records in that ancient church. And thus the agreeing testimony of these two writers confirm each other, and assure us of the series and succession of the Scottish kings, such as they were contained in their ancient annals and histories before the year 1291.

I cannot finish this account of James Gray without taking notice that he is probably the same person mentioned at the end of the second book of the ms. *Scotichronicon* (one of the fullest of that kind) belonging to the honourable family of Panmure. The words of this ms. are: 'Explicit liber secundus *Scotichronicon* 9 Januar. in Edinburg. oppido, A.D. 1480, per me magnum Macculloch,' (and in another hand) '& per me Jacobum Gray illuminatus.' If this was the same James Gray, author of the aforesaid catalogue of our kings, as both this date and the name make me think it was, then in that case it would appear that either this catalogue of our kings

must have been extracted by him before he saw John Fordun's chronicle; or if after he saw it, which is more likely, we must suppose that he looked upon the records whence he took his catalogue as of greater authority than Fordun's chronicle, since in the names, succession, and chronology of our kings, he hath followed these records preferably to Fordun. And thus far as to our writers of the second class.

SEC. III.—*Of John Fordun, of his Continuators and Followers, and other Writers of our Ancient History, till the year 1526.*

We have already given an account of John Fordun,¹ and of the occasion of his compiling the Scotish history, and we shall again have further occasion elsewhere to treat of him. At present it suffices to remark that he wrote in the reigns of Robert II. or III., but that it appears that his history was not published or much known till afterwards; that Walter Bowmaker, abbot of Inchcolm, made additions to it and a continuation of it in the reign of King James II. This chronicle was followed on or continued by several others,—such as Patrick Russel, a Carthusian monk; Macculloch, canon of Scoon; and in general all our other monastery books (except that of Maylros), such as *Liber Paslatensis*, *Cuprensis*, *Sconensis*, etc., were nothing else but copies of Fordun till the death of King David I., with some few interpolations of their own, and a continuation of his history down to the death of King James I.; and these copies of Fordun, with the continuation, is what is called *Scotichronicon*. Of all which there were also several abridgments, whereof a large account may be found in Dr. Nicholson's Scotish historical library, and in M. Hearn's remarks and appendixes to his edition of Fordun, to which I refer for brevity.

II. To this third class of our writers ought to be referred a ms. chronicle of Scotland, translated from Latin into French by one Grem. Domate, and dedicated to John, Duke of Albany, in the year of our Lord 1519. This ms. belongs to the library of the abbey of St. Geneoveve in Paris. It is in folio, marked M. 2. It is a very literal translation into French of Fordun, with the same continuator which, in the Bodleian Library, Cod. ms. 3888, bears the title of Bishop Elphinston's history. But it would seem by this ms. that the original was written by order of the Abbot of Dunfermline, and probably the copy that Domate made use of belonged to that abbey.

This translator hath made many mistakes in his translation, and the copy is very defective. What seems most remarkable

¹ *Supra*, p. 123.

in it is an appendix in eight leaves on vellum, containing a kind of abridgment of the Scotish history, with pictures of the kings, from Galahel or Gaythel and Scota downwards, in very coarse miniature. And here we have a first essay of the names of these ancient kings of Scots that are said to have preceded King Fergus, son of Erch. Their names, according to this writer, are as follows:—

1. Galahel or Gaythel, and Scota ; 2. Hiber ; 3. Himec ; 4. Nonael ; 5. Micelium (Milesius) ; 6. Bartholon ; 7. Another Micelio ; 8. Simon Breac ; 9. Ethae Rothsay ; 10. Fergus ; 11. Rether ; 12. Maher ; 13. Anonyme ; 14. Jayr ; 15. Eteorac, in the time of Dioclesian ; 16. Phaleg, in the time of Carausius ; 17. Eugenius ; 18. Hurgust (who was king of the Picts, otherwise called Eubotha) ; 19. Fergus (this was Fergus II., son of Erch) ; and from him he continues the ordinary names of the kings as in Fordun, with their pictures, till King James I.; but as the number of kings he mentions before Fergus II. is far short of the forty-five which Fordun says we had, so they are very different names and personages from those forty that Boece found about six years after Domate, in his famous MSS. of Veremund, etc. However, we may observe by this that attempts were made to fill up this gap of the history before Fergus II. which Fordun and his continuators had left. All of them, though they tell us there were forty-five kings before Fergus II., yet they neither give us any account of them, nor so much as their names, except of three, Fergus I., Rether, and Eugenius.

III. To this third class of our writers belongs also John Major's history, it being a short abridgment of Fordun or of some of his continuators, intermixed with an abstract of the English history, and with many reflections and scholastic reasonings of his own. It gives us no further account of the forty-five kings before Fergus II. than Fordun. It was printed very incorrectly at Paris, A.D. 1521, whilst the author was absent in Scotland. Among other errors of copyists, or of the print in John Major's printed history, ought without doubt to be reckoned this passage, lib. 2, c.1 : ‘*Inter hunc Fergusium filium Erth & primum Fergusium filium Ferchardi quindecim Scotorum erant reges, & ultra septingentorum annorum tempus,*’ etc., for all the copies of Fordun (whereof Major is only an abstract) have forty-five kings ; and in Major's own account, in the following seven hundred years from Fergus II. till Edgar, there are fifty-one kings, that is, above thrice fifteen. So this must be visibly a mistake of the ciphers 15 for 45, either in Major's copy or in that which he followed, which the publisher hath printed at length by mistake.

IV. To the same class ought to be reduced a short abridg-

ment of the Scotish history, by the title of *Brevis Chronica*, annexed to Winton's chronicle ms. in the Lawyers' Library at Edinburgh. This short chronicle begins with Gathelas and Scota, and brings down the history to the reign of King Robert II. Though the author lived after Boece, and even after his translator Bellenden, yet, as to our remote antiquities, and all that passed before Fergus II., he is to be classed among the followers of Fordun, of whom he is an exact abridger till Fergus II.'s time, and hath no more than he of the first forty kings, not so much as their names, though he had before him Boece's history translated by Bellenden, and follows him from Fergus II. downwards in the character of our kings; and from Constantine III. he generally quotes book and chapter of Bellenden's translation of Boece. This his designedly omitting all the story, and even the names, of the first forty kings of Boece, which he had before him, shows plainly that Boece's account of them, over and above what Fordun had left, was not at first relished even by all our Scotish writers.

SEC. IV.—*Our Fourth Class of Scotish Writers; of Boece, Buchanan, and their followers.*

I have already treated at so great length of Hector Boece, George Buchanan, and their chief followers' performances, that it would be superfluous to insist further on them in this place. What more may be proper to say of them will come in more seasonably elsewhere.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE TRUE EPOCH OF THE FIRST SETTLEMENT OF THE SCOTS, AND BEGINNING OF THEIR MONARCHY IN BRITAIN.

After the account I have given in the preceding chapter of the writers of the Scotish history, and of the remains we have of monuments or records concerning the most ancient part of it, I am now to treat, 1st. Of the time of the first settlement of the Scots in Britain. 2d. Of the first king of the Scots in Britain. 3d. Of the beginning of his reign, which is the epoch of the monarchy of the Scots in this island. 4th. For a more full satisfaction, and a general answer to the objections against the system of the high antiquities of the Scots which I have

here set down, I shall conclude the essays by an account of the different steps and degrees by which the high antiquities of the Scots seem to have grown up by length of time, in the several hands through which they passed, into the plan of history in which they were delivered by our modern writers.

ART. I.—*Of the First Settlement of the Scots in Britain.*

The opinion of the coming in of the Scots, and of their having been settled in Ireland many ages before the incarnation, having been received among the Irish, as we see by Nennius, before the ninth age, it is no wonder that the Scots in Britain, looking on themselves as descended of the Scots in Ireland, and having among them bards of the same genius as those in Ireland, should have afterwards by degrees claimed to themselves a high antiquity.

But having already shown the uncertainty of the grounds on which the Irish build their pretensions to remote antiquity in the Scotish line, and having proved that there is much more ground, from the best information that we can have of ancient times, to be persuaded that the settlement of the Scots, even in Ireland, was only about the time of the incarnation, or even after it;—from this it follows that the settlement of the Scots in Britain must be yet of a later date, since it would seem natural that there should be some time allowed to the Scots in Ireland to establish themselves there, and multiply so as to be able to send out a colony to the northern parts of Britain.

But if we suppose, what is credible enough, and wants not ground in antiquity, that the Scots did not settle at first in a full body and by force in Britain, but came in by degrees; that they first possessed some of the western islands, and, coming over in small numbers, obtained habitations, with the allowance of the Picts, on the north-western coasts, where they lived at first united to the Picts in Britain, and joined with them in their expeditions against the Romans or provincial Britains;—in this supposition, the first coming in of the Scots to Britain may have been not long after their settlement in Ireland. Besides that, in the supposition of the Scots coming originally from Scandia (of which we have treated elsewhere¹), whilst the greatest number of them passed forward to Ireland, some of them might have stopped at the western islands or coasts of Britain, and there fixed their seats by consent of the Picts, willing to have them auxiliaries in their wars against the Romans and Britains, as we observe they were from the first time of the Scots settling in Britain. And a further proof of

¹ *Supra*, p. 295.

the early settlement of the Scots in Britain is, that the first author that speaks of them¹ mentions them in Britain about the year 360, as we shall show.

Bede² leaves it uncertain whether the Scots settled at first among the Picts by force or by favour: '[Scoti] Duce Reuda de Hybernia egressi vel amicitia vel ferro sibimet inter eos (Pictos) sedes quas hactenus habent, vindicarunt. A quo, viz. duce, usque hodie Dalreudini vocantur.' Bede adds, that the Scots, on their coming to Britain, settled on the north side of the Frith of Cluyd, which was of old the boundary of the Britains and Picts on the west of Britain. Bede informs us here that in his time the Scots in Britain were called as yet Dalreudini. Nennius³ also, in the ninth age, calls the possessions of the Scots in Britain *Regiones Dalrietae*; and, long after Nennius, the anonymous writer, printed in the appendix⁴ to this essay, calls the kingdom of the Scots in Britain, before their union with the Picts, by the name of *Regnum Dalrietae*,⁵ or the kingdom of Dalrede.

The Irish writers⁶ give ample accounts of the origin of the name of Dalriada. These accounts may be seen set down at great length by Dr. Kenedy.⁷ They derive the name Dalriada, not without probability, from Eocha Riada, who, they say, was also called Carbre Riada (son of King Conar), the same with Bede's Reuda. He is called, in the best copies of the old genealogy of the kings of Scots, Eocha or Eochad Riada or Riede (as may be seen in the genealogical table, p. 140); and, in the later and more incorrect copies, the name is written Ethod Riede, from whence is derived Boece's twenty-fifth king, Ethodius I., who reigned, according to Buchanan, A.D. 163.

The same Irish writers acknowledge that the Scots came from Ireland to Britain under the conduct of this Eocha Riada, son of Conar, who according to them was king of Ireland, and died A.D. 219; so the coming over of his son Eocha Riada with the Scots into Britain may have happened about the beginning of the third age. But it must have fallen out more early, if we could depend upon the tenor of the old genealogy of our kings, such as we have shown⁸ that all our writers do uniformly deliver before Boece's new genealogy appeared. For, according to this old genealogy,⁹ Eocha Riada Mac-Conar was in the thirteenth degree before Erch, father to Fergus; so that though this Fergus Mac Erch be placed in the end of the fifth

¹ Ammian, lib. 20.

² Bed. Hist. lib. 1, c. 1.

³ Nennius, c. 9.

⁴ Append. No. 3.

⁵ 'Iste [Kenethus] biennio antequam veniret Pictaviam Dalrietae regnum suscepit.'—Append. No. 3.

⁶ Usher, Antiq. Brit. pp. 320, 321.

⁷ Ken. Geneal. pp. 103, 104, etc.

⁸ Supra, pp. 140, 141, etc.

⁹ Vide the tables, p. 140.

or beginning of the sixth century, allowing thirty years to each generation, the coming in of Eocha Riada with the Scots to Britain would have happened in the beginning of the second century, which would have been too early, supposing that the Scots came into Ireland only about the time of the incarnation, since some length of time must be allowed to the Scots, after their coming into Ireland, to settle themselves and multiply in that island, before they could send out any colonies.

It were easy to solve this difficulty by the method that some Irish writers make use of in like cases. For when they find in their genealogies the number of generations too great to agree with any period of time for settling a chronology, they do not hesitate to reduce these exorbitant generations to the precise number that fits their purpose, making no difficulty to cut off as many generations as they find expedient of these old genealogies composed by their seanachies, notwithstanding all the regulations of their Parliaments of Tarach, of the Committee of Nine, and all the strict examinations that they pretend¹ were made of these productions of their seanachies, and the precautions for preserving them. We have elsewhere² observed their reductions of this kind, and O'Flaherty alone could furnish many examples of it. And, not to depart from the present case, they tell us that there are,³ according to their antiquaries, eleven descents or generations from Eocha Riada till Fergus the son of Erch, which, as they think, is two generations more than enough for that period of time; and accordingly Dr. Kenedy⁴ is at great pains to make a reduction of them to a smaller number, and strikes off two of them.

But as all these genealogies and other domestic accounts of the remote antiquities of the Irish and Scots appear very uncertain, considering the little probability there is that they had, before the fifth age, the use of letters or any other sure means to preserve true accounts of past transactions, we must therefore endeavour to find some light into this dark subject of the first coming in of the Scots to Britain, in the more certain accounts given us by the Roman writers.

Ammian Marcellin,⁵ the first writer that mentions the Scots, gives us the following account: That, A.D. 360, towards the latter end of the reign of the Emperor Constantius, in Britain, the Scots and the Picts, two fierce peoples, having violated the peace and broken into the fixed limits of the empire in that island, were

¹ D. Kened. Geneal., Praef. pp. 17, 18, etc.

² *Supra*, pp. 268, 269, etc.

³ D. Ken. Gen. p. 115.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 116, 117, etc.

⁵ 'In Britanniis Scotorum Pictorumque gentium ferarum excursu, rupta quiete, conducta limitibus loca vastata sunt, & implicabat formido vicinas provincias, præteritarum cledium congerie fessas,' etc.—Ammian. lib. 20.

ravaging the provinces of it, which filled with terror the provincials, spent and wearied with their former invasions in times past. Upon this news, the Cæsar Julian, then residing in Gaul, began to give orders for repulsing of them, etc., which, nevertheless, as appears by the following part of Ammian's history, was not effectually done till about the year 367 or 368, that the general Theodosius was sent over to Britain by Valentinian I.

It is to be remarked in this narrative of Ammian, that though this be the first time that the Scots are mentioned by him, or indeed by any certain writer of or before these times, yet it appears by him that the Scots were already looked upon not only as formidable enemies of the empire in Britain, but that this was not the first time that the Scots, in conjunction with the Picts, had invaded and ravaged the Roman provinces in this island, since he adds that the provincials were struck with so much the greater terror of these enemies, that they were already quite wearied and spent with a great number of ravages they had made in former times : ‘*Præteritarum cladium congerie fessas,*’ etc.

From this I conceive it follows that the Scots must have been some considerable time before this settled in the island, before they could be able to make so considerable a figure in Britain as to be taken notice of by Ammian, as being no less dangerous enemies of the empire in Britain than the Picts or Caledonians.

Now this may very well agree with the placing the coming in of Eocha Riada (the same as Bede's Reuda), the first leader of the colony of the Scots, into Britain about the beginning of the third age. It is like he brought over, at first, but a small number, not to give jealousy to the ancient inhabitants of these parts, the Caledonians; but in the space of one hundred or about one hundred and fifty years, that passed betwixt the time of their first coming in and their being mentioned by Ammian, A.D. 360, they might have so increased, both within themselves and by accession of new auxiliaries from Ireland, that the Caledonians or Picts, finding them serviceable in their wars against the Romans and provincial Britains, were easily disposed to enlarge the possessions of the Scots on the north-western coasts of the island, in proportion as the Caledonians themselves¹ enlarged their own bounds, by new conquests, to the south of the Friths. And thence it happened that the Scots made so considerable a figure in Britain, according to Ammian, about the middle of the sixth century. But we might have had a much more full account, both of the Scots and of the other ancient inhabitants of Britain, had that book

¹ *Supra*, pp. 68, 69.

of Ammian been preserved in which, as he tells us,¹ he had given a description of Britain.

According to the antiquaries of Ireland, this colony of Scots, which was brought over and settled in Britain by Eocha Riada, began a lasting establishment in this island. ‘Our writers,’ says D. Kenedy,² ‘unanimously tell us that Eocha (he calls him Carbre) Riada, was the founder of the Scotish sovereignty in Britain; but they make him only a captain, as Bede does, or conductor, who ingratiated himself so far with the Picts, by his and his children’s good service against the Britains, that they consented that they and their followers should continue among them.’ It is true this same writer adds a little afterwards, that these first Scots who settled in Britain had not laid aside thoughts of returning back sometime or other into their mother country Ireland, but their continuing ever after, they and their posterity, to inhabit Britain, demonstrates that they had no such thoughts; and this writer himself tells us,³ that about one hundred years after their coming, Fergus Ulidian, who, according to him, was great-grandchild to Eocha Riada, and chief of the Dalriadans in Ireland, did, about the beginning of the fourth century, strengthen the Dalriadian colony in Pictland with new supplies, as his successors continued to do from time to time. And he informs us afterwards,⁴ that about A.D. 386, Niel, king of Ireland, came over to the north of Britain, and obliged the Picts to draw off what families they had in Cantyre and Argyle, and suffer the Dalriadys to inhabit alone that side of the country, and live separately without any mixture of Pictish families, to the end they might be the more secure from any insults or oppression of the Picts, who, it seems, were become jealous of their increasing, and therefore had endeavoured to keep them under, and dispersed them in different cantons, mixed with Pictish families.

I relate this on the credit of this writer, who gives us these particulars of the Dalriadys or Scots in Britain in these early times, as taken from the accounts of them left by the Irish seanachies. By which it appears, at least, that the traditions of their antiquaries were that the Scots, from their first coming into the north of Britain, and beginning a settlement under Eocha Riada, their first leader, towards the beginning of the third century, had still continued, without interruption, to inhabit those parts till this time, that is, till towards the end of the fourth age.

But we have a more certain account from the Roman and

¹ Ammian. p. 347.

³ Ibid. p. 130.

² Ken. Geneal. p. 107.

⁴ Ibid. p. 133.

British writers, of their continuing to make a considerable figure in Britain, from A.D. 360, when the name of Scots is first mentioned by Ammian, and a chronological series of their expeditions, in conjunction with the Caledonians or Picts, against the Romans and provincial Britains, as long as Britain remained united to the empire, and down till the fifth age.

We have already given account from Ammian of that irruption of the Scots and Picts on the provincial Britains, A.D. 360. Now the Cæsar Julian, who was then in Gaul, being wholly taken up with the ambitious design of usurping the empire, and supplanting his uncle the Emperor Constantius, put no effectual remedy to the disorders of Britain. So the Picts and Scots made daily new progress; and it appears by the same Ammian,¹ that upon Valentinian I.'s coming to the empire, A.D. 364, he found, among other Roman provinces invaded by the barbarous nations in their neighbourhood, those of Britain exposed to the ravages, not only of the Picts and Scots, but that the example of their impunity had drawn also in upon the Britains other new enemies, to wit, the Saxons and the Attacoti.

Valentinian, finding the empire attacked all at once on so many sides, was not in condition so soon to send assistance to the Britains; so the Picts and Scots advanced daily in the British provinces, and their numbers and boldness increasing by their success, they killed Folla faudus,² a Roman general, and Nectarides, count of the maritime coasts. At last, A.D. 367, the emperor, receiving daily more terrifying accounts of the progress of these enemies in Britain, found it necessary to confide the conduct of that war to one of the most famous generals of the empire, Theodosius, father to the first emperor of that name.

Theodosius,³ being arrived in Britain with a powerful army, obliged the enemies to retire, delivered the city of London from the apprehensions it had been exposed to by the approach of these enemies, and, in a word, forced them out of the bounds of the empire in Britain. The poet Claudian, in two of his panegyrics on the Emperor Honorius, grandchild to this general Theodosius, gives the following account of this expedition in these words in one of them:⁴—

‘ Ille leves Mauros, nec falso nomine Pictos
Edomuit; Scotumque vago mucrone secutus
Fregit Hyperboreas remis audacibus undas.’

¹ Ammian. lib. 26, p. 315.

² Ibid. lib. 27, p. 346.

³ Ibid. p. 347.

⁴ Claudian, Panegyr. in III. Consulat. Honor. Imperat. p. 114.

And in the other :¹

‘ Ille Caledoniis posuit qui castra pruinis.
 . . . incaluit Pictorum sanguine Thule ;
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne.’

These expressions are supposed by some learned English writers to import that this Roman general chased the Scots over the sea into Ireland. But we are not, I conceive, to press poetical hyperboles to the rigour of the letter; otherwise we must suppose also that Theodosius pursued the Picts to Thule, and there made a great slaughter of them, whereas it is like that neither Claudian nor the Romans knew where Thule was situated. However, as to the Scots, it appears to me that, long after their first settlement in Britain, they 'still continued to live in a close union with the Scots in Ireland, as being one and the same people; and that, besides those already established in Argyle, Cantyre, in the western isles, etc., others of them were accustomed in those early times to come over in greater or smaller numbers from Ireland to Britain, as occasion offered, either to enlarge the possessions of the Scots in Britain, or to march as auxiliaries in conjunction with the Scots in Britain, and with the Picts to make inroads or excursions into the Roman provinces; and that in case of any great defeat, as it happened in this expedition of Theodosius, they had always a safe retreat, some of them to the extremities of the western coasts or islands of Britain, others of them, especially those that had come over only as adventurers or auxiliaries, back to Ireland, to wait, when the enemy retired, for a new opportunity of preying on the Britains.

However, as to the poet Claudian's expressions, the words *hyperborreas undas* may be at least as naturally understood of the northern friths, over which this general pursued the Scots and Picts, as of the ocean; and supposing by Ierne is meant Ireland, it was very natural for the Scots in Ireland to lament the slaughter of so great a number (*cumulos*) of their friends and kinsmen as Theodosius had killed of the Scots in Britain; besides the loss of a great number of adventurers or auxiliary Scots, natives of Ireland, that came over, as it hath been observed, in these early times, to join those in Britain in their expeditions against the provincials.

Theodosius, to secure them against those irruptions of their northern enemies, fortified anew the northern wall, and made it again the boundary of the empire, as it had been settled 230 years before under the empire of Antonin, and placed guards and garrisons² on it to watch and oppose the enemy's motions.

¹ Claudian, Panegyr. in IV. Consulat. Honor. Imperat. p. 119.

² ‘ Limites vigiliis tuebatur & pretenturis.’ —Ammian.

But the most remarkable action of this general in Britain was the erecting all the territories betwixt the southern wall in Northumberland, and the northern at the friths, into a fifth Roman province in Britain, and calling it after the emperor by the name of Valentia. I abridge those accounts which may be treated of more at length in the second part of this essay. Theodosius left the island and returned in triumph, A.D. 370, to the emperor.

A.D. 383, Maximus, having usurped the empire in Britain, before he left the island repulsed with great vigour and overcame the Scots and Picts, according to Gregory of Tours,¹ and the chronicle of Tiro Prosper;² and this is all the ground I find in ancient writers of the subversion of the Scotish state by Maximus, which is set down at such length in *Fordun*; but their defeat by Theodosius looks more like a subversion than what happened under Maximus, who, upon his usurpation, passed immediately over to Gaul, and surprised the Emperor Gratian, having carried over with him all the regular troops from Britain.

A.D. 398, the Scots and Picts, having made use of the opportunity of Maximus' carrying along with him to Gaul the flower of the British youth and best troops, had made such great progress in ravaging the British provinces, that these provinces were almost quite ruined, and lived in perpetual dread and terror of the Picts, who were joined not only by the Scots in Britain, but by new levies of Scots in Ireland. This account of the miserable condition of these provinces being brought to Stilicho, the Roman general under Honorius the emperor, he sent over new forces to Britain against the Scots and Picts, and caused the northern wall to be fortified anew against their irruptions. All this is, in short, related by Claudian,³ where he brings in Britain lamenting its perishing condition till Stilicho sent over those forces to its assistance :

‘ Me quoque vicinis pereuntem gentibus, inquit [Britannia]
Munivit Stilicho, totam cum Scotus Iernem
Movit, & infesto spumavit remige Tethys.
Illi effectum curis, ne bella timerem
Scotica, ne Pictum tremerem,’ etc.

But these auxiliary forces did not remain long in Britain; for, A.D. 402, among the several troops which, by Stilicho's order, came to join him before the battle of Pollentum against the Goths, Claudian marks among others the Roman troops that guarded the wall in Britain in the extremity of the island against the irruptions of the Scots and Picts :

¹ Greg. Turon's Hist.

² Tiro Prosper. in Antiq. Lect. Canis.

³ Claudian, lib. 2, De Laudibus Stilichonis.

‘ Venit & extremis legio Britannis,
Quæ Scoto, dat fræna truci, ferroque notatas
Perlegit exanimis Picto moriente figuras.’¹

The poet here, by an ordinary metaphor, calls the forces that guarded the frontiers of the British provinces a legion, though there used to be always more than one legion placed there to oppose these northern enemies. However, the removal of these troops gave these enemies a favourable opportunity of breaking in upon the provinces.

A.D. 409, the Britains, after calling in vain for assistance against these enemies from the Romans, and encouraged, says Zozimus,² by letters from the Emperor Honorius to do the best they could for themselves, resolved at last to shake off their dependence on the empire, and endeavour to defend their country with their own forces; but they soon found the dismal effects of their presuming too much on their own forces, as appears by the relation of Gildas and of Bede.

But, before I proceed further, it is necessary to take notice of some expressions of these two last historians, which some learned English and Irish writers have endeavoured to wrest against the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, in the manner that I have here accounted for it.

And, 1st, It is to be observed that Bede, after having in the first chapter of his history given a short account of the first coming of the Picts and Scots into Britain, as being next to the Britains the most ancient inhabitants of this island, never mentions again either the one or the other of them till the twelfth chapter, when, upon the occasion above mentioned of the Britains shaking off, A.D. 409, all dependence upon the empire, and resolving to defend their country by their own forces, they became an easy prey to the northern inhabitants of the island, the Scots and the Picts, the terror of whom forced the Britains at last to call in the Saxons to their aid; which gave occasion to Bede to mention again the Scots and the Picts.

From this we may learn (and it is of importance to take notice of it for many other occurrences in the history of these northern people) how weak the arguments are which are drawn from the bare silence of Bede concerning the transactions among the Scots and the Picts, or, indeed, concerning any of the inhabitants of Britain, excepting the Saxons or English alone. For whosoever will read Bede’s history with attention, will easily find that after the Saxons or English (the great object of his history) were come and settled in the island, he scarce ever mentions either the Scots or the Picts, or even

¹ Claudian, *De Bello Getico*, p. 107.

² Zozim. *Hist. lib. 6*, pp. 376, 381.

the old Britains, but upon occasion of the Saxons, and of some transaction among those ancient people necessary to give light into the history of the Saxons. Thus, as it would be a very false conclusion to argue from the silence of Bede that there never were in Britain any such people as Caledonians, because Bede never mentions them, or that the same people known by the name of Picts, and the Scots, from their first entry into this island, had lain wholly inactive and made no figure in Britain till A.D. 409, whereas the contrary is evident by the certain testimony of the Roman writers concerning the Caledonians or Picts, and by that of the same Roman and even Irish writers concerning the Scots, as we have just now made appear; so it were against the equity and candour becoming a faithful writer to refuse to credit any other transaction among the old Britains, Picts, or Scots, precisely because it is not mentioned by Bede. However, it must be acknowledged at the same time, that the Scots and all the other inhabitants of Britain owe very great obligation to Bede for the knowledge of a great many ancient accounts of their history, of which, without Bede's mentioning them, they had remained wholly ignorant; though he generally does not mention them but as far as they interfere with the church history of the Saxons or English, which is all that Bede promises by the title of his book, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*.

2d. Gildas, speaking of the Picts and Scots, calls them *transmarinæ gentes*.¹ From which expression Bishop Usher and Dr. Stillingfleet would conclude that the Scots who invaded the Britains were as yet, that is, about A.D. 422, all of them inhabitants of Ireland, and none of them hitherto settled in Britain. But besides that, Gildas, in this place, calls equally the Picts as much as the Scots *transmarine*, or a people from beyond the seas, though nobody doubts but the Picts were long before settled in the island. Bede, who in the first chapter of his history had described the Scots among the ancient inhabitants of this island, reckoning the Britains the first, in the next place the Picts, and the Scots the third people who settled in Britain, accordingly explains this expression of Gildas, and informs us that the Picts and Scots are called *transmarinæ gentes*, people from beyond the seas; ‘not that they dwelt out of the island of Britain, but that their habitations in the island were separated from those of the Britains by the two arms of the sea, or the Friths of Clyde and Forth.’²

¹ Gild. c. 11.

² ‘Transmarinas autem dicimus has gentes [Pictorum & Scotorum] non quod extra Britanniam essent posita, sed quia a parte Britonum erant remote, duabus finibus maris interjacentibus, quorum unus ab orientali mare, alter ab occidentali, Britannia terras longe lateque irrumpit, quamvis ad se invicem pertingere possint,’ etc. —*Bed. Hist. lib. 1, c. 13.*

3d. Usher and Stillingfleet seem to triumph upon another expression of Gildas¹ copied by Bede,² ‘ Revertuntur impudentes grassatores Hyberni domum.’ And where could be, say they, the home of the Hyberni, but Hybernia or Ireland? Whence they infer that the Scots were as yet, about A.D. 447, still inhabitants of Ireland. But, in the first place, it ought to be considered that, in the language of Bede and of other writers of those times, the names Hyberni and Scotti were as yet synonymous, and given to the same people, inhabitants of Ireland and Britain; and that the name Hyberni was made use of in those early times to express not only the inhabitants of Ireland, but those also of Britain that had their origin from Ireland, that spoke the same language, and were as yet looked upon as the same people, though separated by their habitations; in the same manner as the term Saxones was applied both to the inhabitants of Britain and to those of Germany, from whom they had their origin. And for a proof of the promiscuous usage of the names Hyberni and Scotti, these very same people who are here (c. 14) called Hyberni, are called by the same Bede Scotti, both at their setting out upon this expedition (c. 12) and in his chronicle. And as to the application of the name Hyberni, or Irish, to the Scots in Britain, besides other examples, we find, as far down as the fourteenth age, the name of Irishery³ given to the Highlanders of Scotland, because of their origin from Ireland, and of the Irish language that they still continue to speak.

In the second place, we have already observed that the Scots who were settled in Britain were, in their expeditions against the old Britains, frequently assisted by auxiliaries or adventurers that came over from Ireland, both in order to strengthen the forces of the Scots in Britain, and many of them no doubt in hopes of prey and carrying off captives, which, when the expeditions were over, some of them carried along with them back to Ireland, whilst others remained to fortify and augment the colony of the Scots in Britain; and that upon any great defeat, as it happened in the expedition of the general Theodosius, many of them used to retire to the extremities of the north-western coasts or neighbouring islands of Britain, or even to Ireland. Wherefore, to answer now the question of these learned writers, Where should the home of the Hyberni or Scotti be but in Ireland? If they were of the Scots already settled in Britain, they passed home to their own dwellings in and about Argyle and the north-western coasts of Britain. But if they were only adventurers, that came over either as

¹ Gild. c. 19.

² Bed. lib. 1, c. 14.

³ Archdeacon Barber, in the Life of King Robert the Bruce.

auxiliaries or to prey upon or carry off captives from the Britains, most of them went home again to Ireland ; others, perhaps, remained with their friends in the north of Britain, ready to march with them upon a new expedition as they should find opportunity.¹ *Non post multum temporis reversuri.*

But I wonder that these learned men reflect not upon the little appearance there seems to be of armies of men coming so often from Ireland,² over so dangerous a sea, and the rapid tides that run between Ireland and Britain, and that upon their corroughs or *curucae*, as Gildas calls them. And what a number of those corroughs was requisite to transport armies of men, if they were such as the corroughs made use of as yet in some places in Scotland, which can contain conveniently but two men at once ! One would think it more natural to understand by the sea which they had to pass the Friths of Clyde or Forth, in some places not very broad, and where the corroughs would run no great risk, than a rapid part of the ocean ; and that the quality of the vessels, *curucae*, in which Gildas tells us they used to transport their troops, would rather serve for a new proof that these Scotti or Hyberni that so often infested the Britains were inland inhabitants of Britain, who were separated from the Britains only by the friths, which they easily passed over. And this is further confirmed by Gildas³ telling us that the Scots came *trans Stiticam vallem*, as it was in the former editions, instead of *Scitican*, over the valley which the Frith of Clyde made betwixt the habitations of the Scots and Britains ; for, as it hath been elsewhere observed,⁴ Sciticus and Scoticus are used for the same. But I cannot understand how the passage from Ireland to any part of Britain can be called *vallis*, a valley, whether it be called *Scitica vallis*, or *Tithica*, as Dr. Galet's edition hath it.

3d. Dr. Stillingfleet expatiates upon the injurious names of *impudentes grassatores* and the like, that Gildas gives to the Scots and Picts that ravaged the Britains, and draws inferences from them against the Scots being settled in Britain. But, in the first place, I hope Gildas calling the Scots invaders or pillagers of the Britains (or, if he will, robbers) does not make them outlandish, since there are inland as well as outlandish plunderers or pillagers. Whilst Scotland and England were under two distinct sovereigns, everybody knows what havoc they used to make reciprocally upon the one and the other kingdom, and carry home prey and captives with them, though they were both inland inhabitants of the same island ; and as

¹ Gild. and Bed. *ibid.*

² 'Anniversarias predas cogere solebant.'—*Bed. ibid.*

³ Gild. e. 15.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 294, etc.

to the injurious names that Gildas gives to the Scots, I would be very sorry to imitate Dr. Stillingfleet in drawing consequences from the names that the same Gildas gives to the Saxons; nor will I be so uncivil as even to translate Gildas' ¹ words, where, speaking of the first recruit that was sent to the Saxons into Britain, he thus expresses himself: 'Supra dicta genitrix' (meaning the country of the first Saxons or English) 'primo comperiens agmini fuisse prosperatum, item mittit satellitum canumque prolixorem catastam, quæ ratibus advecta, adunatur cum manipularibus spuriis.' It ought to be considered here that Gildas, beholding his country, so flourishing of old, put by the Saxons to fire and sword, and the old Britains, his countrymen, either massacred or reduced for refuge to fly into corners of the island or into foreign countries, was equally exasperated against the Saxons, as being the immediate authors of these calamities, and against the Scots and Picts, whose invasions had obliged the Britains to call in the Saxons. And therefore he never speaks of the one or the other but in the bitterest terms that the anguish of his heart could suggest. An impartial writer, to judge aright, ought to have regard as well to the circumstances, passions, and temper of an author whom he quotes, as to the letter of his expressions; and that is all I shall say.

This being premised, to return to the chronological account of the Scots in Britain, I shall only touch the last invasions of the Scots and Picts, and refer the reader to Gildas and Bede's narrations for a more full account of them.

A.D. 422, the Britains, who had shaken off their dependence on the empire A.D. 409, finding by experience they were not able to defend their country against the Scots and the Picts,² and after having groaned some years under the oppression of these enemies, were forced to make new application to the Romans, who sent over to them forces which overcame the Scots and Picts, and caused the northern wall between the friths to be repaired, and left the Britains to do for themselves.

A.D. 426,³ the Scots and Picts, leaving the wall, broke in over the friths upon the Britains, which obliged them to have recourse again to the Romans, who sent over new forces, who, after repulsing the enemies, caused the Northumberland wall to be repaired, and took leave of the Britains for the last time. Upon which the Picts took possession of all the extremities of the Roman part of the island, that is, of all the territories that composed the province of Valentia; and no doubt the Scots also made use of this opportunity to enlarge their bounds in

¹ Gild. c. 23.

² Ibid. c. 12; Bed. lib. 1, c. 12.

³ Gildas and Bed. ibid.

the north of the island ; and both the Picts and Scots joined to attack the Northumbrian wall. And thus these northern enemies continued to pillage and oppress the Britains, till they, after seeking in vain new succours from the Romans, called in at last the Saxons to their aid, who soon after turned their arms against them, pillaged the country, and took possession of it, and forced the Britains, some of them to retire to corners of the island, others to abandon it.

By this short account of the Scots in Britain in the earliest times, it appears at least very probable that from their first coming in under Eocha Riada in the third age they still remained inhabitants of Britain, and made a considerable figure during the fourth and fifth ages. And though in their expeditions against the Romans or provincials they generally marched in conjunction with the Picts, and had oftentimes their own forces augmented by auxiliaries and new recruits of the Scots from Ireland, it is noways likely that they could have subsisted all this time without some kind of government of their own in Britain ; nor could that subsist without leaders or chiefs, one or more, both for uniting them when at home, and leading and conducting them in their expeditions. And since they came from Ireland, where there were many lesser kings, I do not see why these leaders or chiefs of the Scots in Britain might not have been called kings as well as some of those of Ireland to whom that title is given, or even as some of those of England during the Heptarchy, or those of the Britains or Welsh in Wales, or in the west of Scotland. So that the expression we will find in the Latin chronicle in metre,¹ that the Scots in Britain, till the time of Fergus the son of Erch, lived without a king, cannot reasonably be taken in the rigour of the letter, as if absolutely the Scots in Britain had not such lesser kings as there were many in Ireland, but that his meaning is that the possessions of the Scots in Britain were not before Fergus, son of Erch, united into one state, and had not a formed government ; in a word, that the Scots, before the time of Fergus, son of Erch, had no sovereign king over all the Scotish inhabitants of Britain such as Fergus son of Erch and his successors were.

For it was this Fergus, as we shall presently show, who united all the Scotish inhabitants of the western parts and isle of Britain, together with the new colonies of Scots that he brought along with him from Ireland, into one body of people ; who extended their bounds in Britain, who freed them from all dependence on the Picts and on the Scots in Ireland ; who erected their possessions in Britain into a sovereignty or independent monarchy, polished them by laws, and settled order

¹ Append. No. 6.

and subordination among them, and first took upon himself the sovereign authority, and (as Fordun, the most ancient of our historians, speaking of his first King Fergus, expresses it) Fergus made himself ‘the first king over the Scots;’ or as Winton, who never saw Fordun’s history, expresses it in the language of his time :

He yat was callit Fergus-more¹
 In ye thryd buke² ze hard besfor
 Wes Fergus Erchs son, yat thre yhere
 Maid him beyond the Drwm to steir
 Oure all the hychtis ever ilkane
 As yai ly fra Drumalbane³
 Cyll Stanemore⁴ and Inchegal
 Ryng he maid hym⁵ oure thaim all.

ART. II.—*Of the First King of the Scots in Britain.*

All the Scotish historians, and all others that mention our kings, do generally agree that the name of the first king of Scots in Britain was Fergus. But they are divided in this, whether it was Fergus son of Ferchard, called Fergus the First, or Fergus son of Erch, called Fergus the Second, who, according to the most ancient genealogy of our kings, lived about thirty-two generations after the first Fergus. All the Scotish historians from Fordun downwards, or since his chronicle was published, about A.D. 1447, have followed his opinion, and own Fergus son of Ferchard for the first king of the Scots, and that he began his reign three hundred and thirty years before the incarnation ; whereas they place the reign of Fergus, son of Erch, or Fergus the Second, in the beginning of the fifth century of Christianity, as Fordun does.

But besides that, this question is already in a great measure decided against Fordun and his followers’ opinion by all that hath been brought to prove that the Scots were not settled even in Ireland, much less in Britain, till after the time of the incarnation, and so could have no king of their nation before that time in either of these countries. Besides this, I say, Fordun himself, the most ancient of our writers that calls Fergus son of Ferchard first king of the Scots, wrote near one hundred years after the time that it is said that the monuments and

¹ Winton, Chron. Book iv. c. 8, Biblioth. Reg. Lond.

² Ibid. Book iii. c. 9.

³ In margin ms., ‘Drum Albane, the back of Albanie.’

⁴ In the register of St. Andrews (whence this was taken) there is ‘Sluah, muere’ or ‘more.’

⁵ Himself.

records of our history were destroyed or carried off by King Edward I., and he brings no document or proof from any credible authority to support his opinion, as we shall see elsewhere.

Whereas all the remains, without exception, which we have of our ancient histories and records, written, extracted, or abridged from them whilst they were yet subsisting, before the year 1291,—all these remains, I say, far from authorizing Fordun's new scheme, do all unanimously contradict it, and agree that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king of the Scots in Britain. I have already given¹ an account of these monuments or remains of our ancient history, and they are all I ever met with concerning our ancient kings written before the year 1291, and each of them that gives any account of the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in Albany places Fergus, son of Erch, the first king, and that in plain terms; so as there needs no more but to set down their words without any commentary.

I shall not here allege for a proof of Fergus, son of Erch, his being reckoned in the twelfth age the first sovereign king of the Scots in Albany, the testimony so plain of the first piece set down in the appendix to this essay, entitled, *De situ Albaniæ*, which was formerly quoted by Camden (and upon his authority by other English and Irish writers), because, as I have already observed,² it appears to me that the author of it was no Scotsman, but that it is probably a production of Giraldus Cambrensis. The reader, if he pleases, may see it in the appendix,³ beginning by these words: 'Fergus filius Eric, ipse fuit primus qui de semine Chonare suscepit regnum Albaniæ,' etc. This piece wants no commentary, being clear upon the point. Whether Gerald had this with the rest of his informations from Andrew, Bishop of Catenes, he does not tell us. However, leaving this to the reader's judgment, I come to the testimony of Scotish writers.

I. The first testimony that I shall bring is from that ancient abstract of our chronicles, entitled, *Chronica Regum Scotorum*, No. 4 in the appendix, and already described.⁴ It begins thus: 'Fergus filius Eric fuit primus qui de semine Chonare suscepit regnum Albaniæ, id est, a monte Drum Albain usque ad mare Hyberniæ, & ad Inchegall. Iste regnavit tribus annis. Domangart filius ejus quinque annis. Congal filius Domangart,' etc., and so continues to give the series of our kings, with the years of their reigns, down to King William, in the twelfth age, when it was abstracted from our old chronicles whilst they were yet in being. This abstract ends in the MS. with King

¹ *Supra*, p. 325, etc.
³ Append. No. 1.

² *Supra*, p. 327.
⁴ *Supra*, p. 329.

William's genealogy up to Noah, as it was then received. According to this genealogy, Fergus-mor-mac-Erch, first of our kings, was in the thirteenth degree from Conare, son to Mogoloma. The son of this Conare was Eocha Riada, who is thought to be the Reuda mentioned by Bede, the leader of the first Scotish colony to Britain.

II. The second testimony is from a very authentic record, an ancient register or chartulary of the church of St. Andrews, written in the beginning of the reign of King Alexander III., about the year 1251, whilst our ancient chronicles were yet to be seen. In this register there is a series or chronological¹ catalogue of the kings of Scots, down till the reign of Alexander III., whereof I have given an account already.² And this series, inserted in that church register, was preserved from the general disaster which fell out forty years afterwards, as were generally all other church registers, records, and libraries.

Now this series of our kings contains, in as express terms as the former testimonies, an account that Fergus, son of Erc or Erch, was the first king of the Scots in Britain, for it begins thus: '1. Fergus filius Erch primus in Scotia regnavit tribus annis ultra Drumalbain usque Sluagmuner & usque ad Inchegall; 2. Douenghart filius Fergus quinque annis regnavit; 3. Congall filius Douenghart,' etc. And thus continues down the series of the kings of the Scots till Alpin, son of Eocha, the twenty-third king. After him he sets down the catalogue of the Pictish kings, to the number of sixty; and then follows out that of the kings of Scotland, from Keneth, son of Alpin, down till King Alexander III., and gives a short account of each king, such as we find in other ancient short chronicles of these times.

III. A third proof of Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots in Britain, is furnished us by James Gray, public notary and secretary to the archbishops of St. Andrews, William Schevez, and Prince James, Duke of Ross, brother to King James IV., in the copy he hath given us in his collections (mentioned elsewhere³) of the series and succession of our kings, transcribed, as we remarked already, from some chronicle or record written during the reign of King William, and which is (allowing difference in the expressions of no moment, and faults of copyists), as to the substance, entirely conformable to the foresaid extract of the register of St. Andrews. This transcript begins thus: 'Fergus filius Herch primus regnavit in Scotia tribus annis ultra Druthin Alban usque Sluaghmore & usque Inchgall. Dovenghard filius Fergus 5 annis regnavit. Congal filius Dovengard,' etc., in the very terms of the St.

¹ Append. No. 5.

² *Supra*, p. 330.

³ *Supra*, p. 340.

Andrews register, except a wrong reading or transcribing the name Drumalban. So the agreement of this transcript of James Gray with the extract of the register mutually corroborates one another; and being written at so different times, the one about the middle of the thirteenth age, the other towards the end of the fifteenth, their agreement proves that they both had their accounts from the same source. But it is observable in James Gray's account of the succession of our kings, that having perused Fordun's history, and being otherwise prevented by the common notions that the Scots had in his days of Fergus, the son of Ferchard, his being the first king and founder of the monarchy, accordingly, before he sets down the account of our kings, he prefixes a *notandum* of his own conformable to the then common notion of the antiquity of the monarchy in the Scotish line. 'Notandum,' says he, 'quod regnum Scotiae incepit ante incarnationem domin. 443 annis;' yet being in a public station, and accustomed to draw up acts, or transcribe them faithfully such as he found them, he caused to be transcribed, without alteration, this account of the succession of our kings, such as he found it in ancient records, however opposite it was to his own, and to the common opinion of the Scots in those days, and ever since Fordun's chronicle had been published.

IV. It will no doubt appear a strange paradox to bring the fourth testimony for Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots in Britain from John Fordun, since the whole design of the second book of his chronicles is to give us the history of Fergus, son of Ferchard, as first king of the Scots, and of forty-five other kings of Scots that succeeded him before Fergus, son of Erch. But such is the force of truth on minds that are not wholly corrupted by a formed design to invent and impose, but only biassed by the popular opinions and prejudices of the times and circumstances in which they live (which we shall see elsewhere was Fordun's case), that they will not absolutely smother all ancient testimonies, though opposite to the opinions they are embarked in, but rather, in quoting them, endeavour to reconcile their own opinions with them. John Fordun, in his searches for memorials of our history, had no doubt seen these ancient abstracts of our ancient chronicles I have quoted above, or others equivalent, and read in them the words I have set down,¹ viz. that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king of the Scotish race, that he reigned from Drum Albayn to Inchgall, and that he reigned only three years, which are the words of the extracts above mentioned; but if they be let pass without a commentary, and

¹ Fordun, lib. 3, c. 2, p. 173, edit. Hearn.

be taken in their literal meaning, they are enough to subvert the whole fabric of Fordun's forty-five kings before Fergus, son of Erch.

Wherefore, to obviate that inconveniency, Fordun supposes a subversion of the Scotish monarchy in the fourth age, upon the grounds we shall elsewhere examine, and by consequence a restoration of the monarchy by Fergus, son of Erch, which gives Fordun a kind of ground to call this Fergus first king of the Scots, viz. after their restoration; and adds that, towards the latter end of his reign, which he supposes lasted sixteen years, he gained some lands (he owns he knows not how) beyond Drumalbayn, and was the first king of the Scotish race that reigned three years in the Pictish land, from the hills to the Scotish sea. But all this varnish will not cover the conformity of his expression with those of the extracts from our old chronicles which I have related, nor hinder them, if taken alone, from having the same meaning among all unprejudiced persons. The words are these: '[Fergus filius Erch] tribus [ultimis] annis ultra Drumalbayn, hoc est, ultra dorsum Albaniæ primus regum Scotiei generis [in terra Pictorum] a montibus ad mare [Scoticum] regnavit.' What is here enclosed in brackets are Fordun's interpolations of our old chronicles to adapt them to his system.

But a manifold proof of Fergus, son of Erch, his having been the first king of the Scots in Britain, is drawn from the short chronicle of the Scots in Latin rhythm or verses, inserted at the end of most of the copies of the *Scotichronicon* as an ancient abridgment of our history, printed in the appendix, No. 5. I have given an account¹ of it already, to which I refer the reader. The first part of this short chronicle ends with the death of King William, and with the eighth chapter, and was written about the time of King Alexander II. or III., as appears by the beginning of the ninth chapter.

V. The first proof drawn from this chronicle of Fergus, son of Erch, his being counted the first king of Scots, is taken from the fifth chapter, where the author, supposing, according to a tradition already received in those days, that the Scots came to Britain before the incarnation, informs us that they lived in Argyle a very long time according to the law of nature (so he expresses it), but without any king, till one called Fergus brought over from Ireland the famous stone to Argyle, and became the first king of the Scots:

'In tamen Ergadia vixit per tempora multa
Hæc gens [Scotorum] sub lege naturæ, sed sine rege,
Donec ad Ergadiam tulit audax nomine quidam

Fergusius lapidem, de quo fit mentio pridem :
 Hic primus rexit Scotos, lapidem quia vexit :
 Quem Scotti lapidem sauxerunt ponere sedem
 Regibus inde suis tantum, sed non alienis.¹

That this Fergus was the son of Erch, the whole series of this chronicle, continued in the next and following chapters, sufficiently demonstrates ; for he begins the next chapter, immediately following the verses above set down, by telling us that this Fergus was the first that reigned in Argyle, and that he reigned three years ; that he was succeeded by Donegard, who reigned five, and he by Congall, etc. ; all which characters, as they agree to this Fergus, son of Erch, and to no other, so they perfectly agree with the three former catalogues of our kings in everything in which they differ from Fordun and his followers' new catalogue of our kings immediate successors to Fergus, son of Erch. These are the words of this short chronicle, cap. 6 :

'Primus in Ergadia Fergus rexit tribus annis
 Post Donegard quinis, Congal quater octo bis,' etc.

VI. A second proof is drawn from what the author of this chronicle tells us, cap. 6, that the Scots reigned in Britain together with the Picts 332, or 312 years 3 months ; for the verses following will bear either of those explications :

'[Scoti] Hi cum prædictis regnarunt tempore Pictis
 Quod trecentenos quater octoque continet annos,
 His annis & tres debetis jungere menses.'—Cap. 6.

Now it is certain that by the middle of the ninth age the Picts ceased to make a distinct people and kingdom by their union and subjection to the Scots ; so counting backward from this union, the number of years here assigned will not reach back farther than the time of Fergus, son of Erch, in the fifth or sixth age, and comes many ages short of Fergus I., who is supposed to have lived 330 years before the coming of Christ, that is, near twelve hundred years before the union of the Scots and Picts.

VII. 3d. This short chronicle assures us that King Alexander III. was the fifty-first king of the Scots.

ALEXANDER III.

'Qui quinquagenus regum fuit ordine primus.'²

And this supposes clearly that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king, there being just fifty-one kings in this author's account, as well as in that of the above-mentioned *Chronica Regum Scotorum*, and in that of the register of St. Andrews, from Fergus, son of Erch, down to King Alexander III. This same

¹ Chron. Rythm. c. 5.

² Ibid. c. 9.

author calls afterwards, c. 10, King John Baliol the fifty-second king.

Before I leave this *Chron. Rythm.* or short chronicle in Latin verses, it is of importance, towards preventing any mistake by alterations in it, to observe that in several copies of the *Scotichronicon*, at the end of which this *Chron. Rythmicum* is to be found, there is, besides other additions, an interpolation at the end of the seventh chapter, containing some Latin verses, for the most part extracted out of different places of Fordun's chronicle, and put together in this interpolation without any suit or coherence; and the whole so oddly and unskilfully inserted in the *Chronicon Rythmicum*, that though we had not a fair and genuine ancient copy of it, without any interpolation, in the ms. *Scotichronicon* in vellum of the Scottish college at Paris, the interpolation would visibly appear to any that reads the whole piece with attention to the sense and coherence.

For the sixth chapter of this *Chron. Rythm.*, to which is subjoined this interpolation, finishes the short account of the succession of our first kings, by telling us that Keneth, son of Alpin, reigned seven years over the Scots before he subdued the Picts; and then, after adding the number of years that the Pictish and Scotish kings reigned together in Albany, which ends this sixth chapter, the seventh chapter, which immediately follows, continues on naturally to tell us how long this King Keneth reigned after he overcame the Picts, and so continues down the succession of our kings where the sixth chapter left off from this King Keneth, till Malcolm Keannor's children, descended partly of the Scotish, partly of the Saxon blood, by Queen Margaret their mother.

Now it is betwixt the sixth and this seventh chapter, which follow so naturally one another, that the unskilful interpolator has placed his addition, taking, 1st, out of cap. 35, lib. 2, of Fordun, the verses 'Christi transactis tribus annis atque ducentis,' etc., giving account of the first planting of Christianity in Scotland. 2d. To these he hath added new verses of his own fabric, containing the coming in of S. Palladius, according to Fordun's account of it. 3d. He joins to those, without any coherence, Fordun's verses (lib. 2, cap. 12), 'Albion in terris rex primus germine Scotus,' etc., describing Fergus, son of Ferchard, as first king of the Scots; and this in plain contradiction to the *Chron. Rythm.*, to which he hath tacked them, whether with a design to elude or embroil the distinct account and manifold testimonies it contains of Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots, I leave to others to judge.

But to return now from this digression, these are all the

monuments written before the year 1291 that give any account of the succession or series of the kings of the Scots that hitherto I have had occasion to meet with. And it is not improper to take notice that they are almost all of them written in different places, by different authors, and on different occasions, without communication; and yet all agree together exactly in the same names, order, and number of kings, and in placing Fergus, son of Erch, as the first of them, and equally differ from Fordun and his followers.

Perhaps this essay may give occasion to the curious and learned of our country or elsewhere to discover and remark other ancient pieces of the same tenor. But I dare confidently affirm beforehand, that in no genuine writer before the year 1291, and our contests with King Edward I. about the year 1300, will be found any certain account of the first forty kings, or of any sovereign kings at all of the Scots in Britain before Fergus, the son of Erch. And now I refer it to the judgment of any impartial man, whether the authority of the monuments I have here made use of, however short and lame they may appear, all written by authors who had before them our genuine ancient writers as yet in being, and who extracted with simplicity from them a short account of the beginning of the Scottish monarchy and succession of the kings,—whether, I say, authors so well informed and so void in all appearance of prejudice and design, their testimony be not preferable to the contradictory accounts given of the monarchy and of our ancient kings by posterior authors, deprived of the help of our genuine ancient chronicles, and biassed by so many prejudices.

VIII. To confirm what the monuments I have already cited unanimously affirm of Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots in Albany, I shall as yet bring for an eighth testimony the authority of one author, who, though he lived after Fordun or about his time, yet he never saw his work, which was not as yet published, or at least generally known, till about A.D. 1447 or 1448, probably after this author's death. This is Andrew Winton, prior of Lochleven, who wrote his chronicle (of which we have already given an account¹) towards the end of the reign of King Robert III., or during the captivity of King James I. This author, though he believed, according to the tradition received long before his time, that the Scots were settled in Britain before the incarnation, and writing about one hundred years after the opinion (first vented during our debates with King Edward I. about the independency) of the Scots having had ancient kings in Britain even before the incarnation, had, by length of time, and as being honourable to

¹ *Supra*, p. 337.

the nation, spread itself and gained credit among the generality,—though Winton, I say, writing in that juncture, was much inclined to believe the Scots had kings before the incarnation;—1st, yet not only when he sets down¹ the old genealogy of the Scotish kings from Simon Breac downwards, he reckons, among the rest of the names of the ancestors of our kings, that of Fergus, son to Ferchar or Feraret in the genealogical line, without taking any the least particular notice of him, as he doth of the famous men among them, such as Simon Breac, and Fergus, son of Erch, and without the least insinuation of this Fergus, son of Ferchar, his ever having been the first king or a king of the Scots at all, no more than any of the rest. But, 2d, when he comes down with the genealogical line to Fergus, son of Erch, he² calls him expressly the first king of the Scots in Britain, and looked upon that as so constant and certain an historical truth, that he repeats it no less than three times in three or four different places of his chronicle.

What is remarkable, and shows how much it was fixed in the minds of the Scots as yet in Winton's time that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king, is that Winton himself, overswayed by the prevailing new opinion of the Scots having had kings three or four hundred years before the birth of Christ, or rather before the Piets, who he supposeth began to reign two hundred years before the incarnation, on the one hand; and on the other hand, being assured that the first king of the Scots was Fergus, son of Erch, and that there were but ten generations³ betwixt this Fergus and Kenneth MacAlpin, who lived above eight hundred years after the birth of Christ;—after a fruitless effort in two places in his chronicle to reconcile this contradiction, at last finding it impossible to make ten or eleven generations in those times fill up twelve hundred years, he chooses rather to bring down the beginning of the Scotish monarchy to more modern times, and to grant that the Piets were already settled and their monarchy subsisting in Britain when the Scots came into it, than to doubt of Fergus, son of Erch, his being their first king. This shows how certain this was as yet even in Winton's time, and that he had never seen Fordun's chronicle; otherwise he could not have failed to mention at least the distinction of two Ferguses, I. and II., which, if it had been grounded, would have solved all his difficulties.

Thus Winton, in the first drafts or editions of his chronicles, such as it is in all the MSS. of it that I have seen in Scotland

¹ Winton's Chronicle, in Biblioth. Cotton. Nero, D. xi. lib. 3, fol. 30.

² Ibid. lib. 3, fol. 30; lib. 4, fol. 37, 38, 43.

³ Ibid. lib. 3, fol. 7; lib. 4, fol. 43. ⁴ *Vide Appendix, No. 7.*

or England, excepting one, the most valuable of all, which belongs to the king's library at London, whereof I have already given an account,¹ and which contains the last review made by himself of his chronicle, with some considerable additions and corrections. In this not only he still persists to make Fergus, son of Erch, first king of the Scots, but, what the ordinary copies of his chronicles do not contain, he informs us, no doubt from the records of St. Andrews, to which he belonged, and conformably to the accounts of all the above-mentioned writers that had been published till his time, that 'Fergus,' son of Erch, first king of the Scots, reigned three years from Drum-alban to Inchgall, Douengart, his son, five years, to whom succeeded his son Congal,' etc., and continues on a chronological series of our kings, with their genealogy and years of their reigns, till Eocha-rinneval, called by our moderns, after Fordun, Eugen. v.

And now we have seen, by the agreeing testimonies of all our ancient writers, without exception, not only of those who wrote before the year 1291, but of all of them that we have remaining before the publication of Fordun's *History*, under the reign of King James II., that Fergus, son of Erch, was still believed to have been the first king of the Scots, and that, till the *History* of Fordun was published, we have not one word, in any writer extant, of Fergus, the son of Ferchard, his being the first king, or a king at all of the Scots, nor in the old genealogy of our kings any particular notice taken of his name, except by Fordun, no more than of so many other names in that genealogy.

It is further worth observing, that the tradition of the Scotish monarchy's beginning by one Erch, or the son of Erch, was so rooted in the minds of the Scots, that even in their instructions to their commissioners at Rome (A.D. 1300), during the debate with King Edward before the Pope (where we find the first notions of kings of Scots before the incarnation), they visibly point at one Erch as the founder of their monarchy: 1st, By deriving from Erch and Gatheyl the name of their first settlement in Britain; and 2d, By their naming no other king of Scots but Erch, whom they bring in both the first king of the Scots in Britain, in the highest antiquity, and again as a king of the Scots about the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth age, where our moderns place the restoration of monarchy. And thus far as to the authorities of Scotish writers before Fordun, who all agree that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king of Scots.

It would have perhaps appeared invidious to have brought

¹ *Supra*, p. 338.

² Appendix, No. 7.

the testimonies of English or Irish writers to prove this delicate point; for which reason, also, I have not alleged the testimony, so clear for this purpose, contained in the description of Albany,¹ and quoted by Camden and others, because I suppose Giraldus Cambrensis was author of that description; and therefore, having sufficient proofs from the Scotish ancient writers, I have designedly abstained from quoting the others, and shall refer my reader, if he desires further information and other proofs, to Archbishop Usher's *Antiquitates Britanniae*,² Flaherty's *Ogygia*,³ etc., and others of lesser note among the Irish, and of the English to Camden's *Scotia*, to the *History of Church Government of Britain*, etc., by Dr. Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, and Dr. Stillingfleet's *Antiquities of British Churches*, in all which they will find this argument treated most part from testimonies drawn from Irish writers, which, though I have not made use of in examining this question, yet I am persuaded they may be very serviceable to the Scotish history.

But in order to that it ought to be observed, 1st, That a great difference is to be made betwixt the histories or annals of Ireland, containing accounts of transactions passed since King Leogaire and St. Patrick's time, and those pretended old histories of the Irish, which, they gave out, were written by their seanachies before the times of Christianity, or even before they received the gospel with the use of letters. As to these last, we have endeavoured to show elsewhere,⁴ at length, that these pretended ancient histories being built upon the dubious foundation of the bards' traditions, there is no weight to be laid upon them; whereas the first, that is, their historical accounts, written since they received Christianity, deserve much more credit.

2d. A great difference ought also to be made among the Irish writers, even since they had the use of letters, betwixt those of their histories or annals that contain the accounts of the succession of kings, bishops, and other such public transactions within or without that kingdom, such as Tigernach's annals, the Ulster annals, the *Synchronisms* of Flann, where they relate matters that happened since King Leogaire's time, on the one hand, and on the other, the uncertain rhapsodies of genealogies, some of the legends of saints, written by anonymous, obscure, or credulous authors, especially in the Irish tongue. I do not see why the first, to wit, their more received histories and annals, when fairly published, accompanied with good proofs of the authenticity of their originals, and an

¹ Appendix, No. 1.

³ *Ogygia*, p. 465, etc.

² Usher, *Antiq. Brit.* pp. 319, 320, etc.

⁴ *Supra*, Book ii. sec. 1, c. 1, *per totum*.

account where they are preserved,—I do not see, I say, why these ought not to be allowed the same authority as writers of other nations, according to the degree of good sense or fidelity of the authors, and the nearness of their time to the transactions they relate.

3d. It hath been already observed,¹ that the Irish interest for a proof of their own pretended remote antiquities would have inclined them, if they had found it well grounded, rather to have raised to a greater height the antiquity of the Scotish settlement in Britain, than to have abridged it, especially since the Scots claimed only an antiquity of about one thousand years later date than what the Irish pretend to.

Besides that in the former times, when the best monuments of the Irish history were penned, we find a constant amicable concord and intercourse of friendly correspondence and amity betwixt the Scots of Britain and the Irish, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, which, as we see by Acts of our Parliament,² A.D. 1427, in King James I.'s time, was still entertained betwixt these two nations, and none of these jealousies and animosities, which have chiefly begun within these two last ages, especially among the Scots and Irish abroad, and since many of both nations were forced to go into foreign countries on the alteration of religion at home, and at soonest, since the Irish became subjects to the kings of England, in the twelfth age. Till these jealousies arose, I do not see why the Irish writers of the eleventh age and upwards might not have fairly related such public transactions of the Scots in Britain as their common origin, language, and usages could not but make them take interest in, and their frequent intercourse made them acquainted with. Thus I cannot but think the testimonies brought by Usher³ from the annals of Tigernach, of Ulster, and the *Synchronisms*, etc., of use towards the settling of the beginning of the reign of Fergus, son of Erch, and fixing it to the year 503, especially since all the most ancient accounts of the Scots agree to bring down his reign till about the beginning of the sixth age.

And in general, though it cannot be expected that the Irish writers will be as exact, or can be as much depended upon, as the Scots themselves in matters relating to Albany, when equally ancient and near the times of the transactions, yet I cannot but here renew again my earnest wishes that those of the Irish writers who treat of transactions in Albany, such as Tigernach, the *Synchronisms*, the Ulster annals, and such like,

¹ *Supra*, pp. 113, 114.

² Black Acts, cap. 71, fol. 11.

³ Usher, Britan. Eccles. Antiq. p. 320.

were faithfully published in a fair and literal translation, if they cannot be printed (as the English have done their Saxon monuments of history) in the original language, with a literal translation joined to them. And I doubt not but the history of the Scots would receive light by their so doing, as the Irish would gain credit to their own history, and honour to the authors of such a laudable undertaking; and it was particularly for this reason that I insisted so much on this subject in the former dissertation.

ART. III.—*Of the Time of the Beginning of the Reign of Fergus, Son of Erch, and proper Epoch of the Monarchy of the Scots in Britain.*

Fordun hath placed the beginning of this Fergus' reign, and of the restoration, as he calls it, of the Scotish kingdom in Britain, in the year 403. Our other historians ever since have generally followed him in that date; only Boece and some of his followers, in order to give this Fergus time to accompany Alaric at the sacking of Rome in 409, hath placed this restoration some few years later.

But this epoch of Fergus' reign, settled on bare conjecture, as we shall show elsewhere, is contradicted both by the account that Fordun himself, as well as all our ancient and modern writers give of the genealogy of our kings, and by all the monuments remaining of our ancient annals before A.D. 1291; all which suppose or prove plainly that the beginning of the reign of Fergus, son of Erch, was about one hundred years later than Fordun hath placed it.

According to the genealogy of our kings received by Fordun and all our other writers, there are but two generations or persons betwixt this Fergus and King Aydan, his great-grandchild; to wit, Dongard, who was son to Fergus, and Gauran, who was son to Dongard, and father to King Aydan. Now, according to Fordun's account, Fergus began his reign A.D. 403, and died A.D. 419, and King Aydan, his great-grandchild, died A.D. 605; so there would be only three generations to take up near two centuries, viz. one hundred and eighty-six years from the death of King Fergus to that of King Aydan, which, in the first place, would be against the common received rule of counting three generations to one hundred years, or of allowing thirty years to each generation; in the second place, it would be absolutely contrary to the experience of all that hath ever happened in Scotland since, where there have always been in the genealogy of our kings at least six generations for every two centuries. And from the death of King Aydan, A.D.

605, till that of the late King James VII., A.D. 1701, there are thirty-six generations, and only one thousand and ninety-six years, or about eleven centuries, which is more than three generations for every century; which shows that there can be no more than one hundred years allowed for the three generations of Dongard, Gauran, and of Aydan, and by consequence, that according to the genealogy owned by all, as well as the fixed epoch of King Aydan's death, A.D. 605, and conformable to the experience of all succeeding ages, the beginning of the reign of King Fergus II. can be placed no higher than the beginning of the sixth century, or about the year 500 of Christ. But all this will better appear by the genealogical table here inserted.¹

It would seem that Fordun, or those who furnished him with memoirs, had been aware of this difficulty; and therefore to obviate it, or rather to hinder it from being taken notice of, care is taken to intermix with the real kings, in the interval betwixt Fergus and Aydan, the names of three supernumerary kings, besides one Kinatill, viz. Eugenius, Constantin, and Ethodius (of all whom there is not the least mention in the more ancient chronicles or catalogues of our kings), and to each of them are given long reigns, to help to spin out the two centuries; for which reason there are also several years added to the reigns of some of the real kings. But this cobweb device is easily dissipated, and can be of no use to the purpose as long as the old genealogy (which could not be so easily altered) remains still the same, even in Fordun's account, and in that of all our writers, and King Aydan but in the third degree from King Fergus; the intermixing these new kings, with the additional number of years of the reigns (which serves only for a blind that is easily seen through), will in no manner mend the matter, and still the same difficulty remains of making three generations fill up two centuries, which in all succeeding ages have required at least double that number of generations, as it were easy to prove by induction, or examples of every two ages or centuries since King Aydan's till the present times.

To render this yet more evident, there needs only to lay aside the seventy-nine years of reign which Fordun, or those that helped him with memoirs, thought fit to assign to the three supernumerary kings (Eugenius, Constantin, and Ethodius), and cut off the twenty-four years which they have added to lengthen the reigns of Fergus and Gauran beyond what the ancient catalogues give them. These two numbers of years (seventy-nine and twenty-four), put together, make up above one hundred years; now, retrenching them, and reckoning back from King Aydan's death, A.D. 605 (which is a fixed

¹ *Vide* Genealogical Table.

GENEALOGICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL SERIES OF THE KINGS OF
SCOTS, FROM FERGUS, SON OF ERCH, TO AYDAN, SON OF
GAVRAN.

I.—According to more Ancient ms. *Chronicles or Catalogues.*

| Began to Reign. | Order of Succession. | Reigned Years. | Died. | Series of Generations. |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| A.D. 503 | 1. Fergus, son of Erc. | 3 | A.D. 506 | Fergus |
| 506 | 2. Dongard, son of Fergus. | 5 | 511 | Dongard 1. |
| 511 | 3. Congal, son of Dongard. | 24 | 535 | |
| 535 | 4. Gabhran, son of Dongard. | 22 | 557 | Gabhran 2. |
| 557 | 5. Conal, son of Congal. | 14 | 571 | |
| 571 | 6. Aydan, son of Gabhran. | 34 | 605 | Aydan 3. |

II.—According to John Fordun and his Followers.

| Began to Reign. | Order of Succession. | Reigned Years. | Died. | Series of Generations. |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------|
| A.D. 403 | 1. Fergus, son of Erch. | 16 | A.D. 419 | Fergus |
| 419 | 2. Eugenius, son of Fergus. | 34 | 452 | |
| 452 | 3. Dongard, son of Fergus. | 5 | 457 | Dongard 1. |
| 457 | 4. Constantin, son of Fergus. | 22 | 479 | |
| 479 | 5. Congal, son of Dongard. | 22 | 501 | |
| 501 | 6. Gonran, son of Dongard. | 34 | 535 | Gonran 2. |
| 535 | 7. Ethod, son of Congal. | 23 | 558 | |
| 558 | 8. Conal, son of Congal. | 10 | 567 | |
| 567 | 9. Kynatel, son of Congal. | 1 yr. 3 ms. | 569 | |
| 569 | 10. Aydan, son of Gonran. | 35 | 605 | Aydan 3. |

epoch on which all parties, Fordun as well as others, agree), there will not remain one full century from the death of King Aydan, A.D. 605, till the beginning of Fergus' reign, which therefore must necessarily be placed after the year 500, or the beginning of the sixth century, and about one hundred years after the year 403, to which Fordun had fixed it.

It is no less evident, by all the ancient abstracts of our chronicles written before the year 1291, that King Fergus' reign can be placed no higher than about the year 500; for according to the three ancient catalogues of our kings, to wit, that of the *Chronica Regum Scottorum*, that of the Register of St. Andrews, that of the chronicle in Latin verse, and those of Winton and Gray, counting all the years of the kings' reigns, from the death of King Aydan, A.D. 605, up to the beginning of King Fergus' reign, it will be found, according to these chronicles or catalogues, that the first of King Fergus amounts no higher than to the year 503; for these catalogues or chronicles (allowing a few faults in the numbers, ordinary to copyists) bear unanimously that,—1st. Fergus, son of Erch, reigned 3 years; 2d. Dongard, son of Fergus, 5 years; 3d. Congal, son of Dongard, 24 years; 4th. Gauran, son of Dongard, 22 years; 5th. Conal, son of Congal, 14 years; 6th. Aydan, son of Gauran, 34 years, and died A.D. 605. Now, counting up the years of the reigns of these six kings, they amount to 102 years, which, being deducted from 605, the fixed epoch of the death of King Aydan, there remains just 503, as another fixed epoch of the beginning of the reign of King Fergus, son of Erch, and by consequence of the monarchy of the Scots in Britain. And this just answers the calculation of the Irish chronicles,¹ whose conformity in this to the most ancient monuments that we have mutually confirms one another.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE DIFFERENT STEPS AND DEGREES BY WHICH THE HIGH ANTIQUITIES OF THE SCOTS GREW UP BY LENGTH OF TIME, IN THE SEVERAL HANDS THROUGH WHICH THEY PASSED, INTO THE PLAN OF HISTORY IN WHICH THEY WERE AFTERWARDS DELIVERED BY THE MODERN WRITERS OF BOTH NATIONS.

Having examined, in the first and second dissertations of this second section, the grounds of the remote antiquities of the

¹ Usher, Britan. Eccles. Antiq. p. 320.

Scots, both in Ireland and Scotland, and endeavoured to fix the true epoch of their coming in, and of their first settlement in both these kingdoms, to finish the matter it remains to answer a vulgar objection which may occur against all I have said; the clearing of which will, I hope, give me occasion, far from abating anything of what I have advanced, to add, on the contrary, a new confirmation to it, and set the whole in a better light.

It may be objected, then, against what I have said, that if the remote antiquities of Ireland and Scotland had been so groundless in their origin, and the epoch of the first settlement and beginning of monarchy of the Scots in these countries not more ancient than I pretend, it seems not possible that the story of the antiquities of both countries, and of the ancient settlement of the Scots, could ever have grown up into such a detail of facts, so apparently regular a succession of kings, attended with genealogies, fixed dates, and the other outward appearances of authentic ancient history, nor be delivered with such an air of assurance as we see that of Ireland is by O'Flaherty, and that of Scotland by Boece and Buchanan.

Though this objection or difficulty be already in a great measure answered by all that we have said at so much length of these remote antiquities, and shown that they have no solid grounds, but rather the characters of invention and of being the work of posterior times, yet to put the whole in greater evidence, I conceive it would not be amiss to endeavour to trace down, as far as the subject will bear, the several steps by which the remote antiquities of both nations have grown up by degrees and length of time, from the first invention of them, into the detail of circumstantiated facts and form of history in which their modern writers present them.

But as to the remote antiquities of Ireland, having in the former dissertation entered, I am afraid, into too great a detail of them for a stranger, though with no other view than to endeavour to set in a due light the first foundations of the remote antiquities of my own country,—I shall inquire no further into those of Ireland, but leave that to the learned, impartial, and judicious writers of that kingdom, who, by a perfect knowledge of their ancient language, and by the access they may have to all that remains of the more ancient and valuable of their historical monuments, are alone equal to such a task. I shall therefore content myself to examine here the progress of these remote antiquities among the Scots in Britain; which, as it will give me an opportunity to discuss some things more fully than I could do in the former part of this dissertation, so I hope that what I am to add here will remove some popular objections, and serve for a new confirmation to the whole.

To put this subject in a clear light, it may be useful to begin by laying before the reader the double scheme of the history of the Scots before Fergus, son of Erch: 1st. Such as it was in reality, as I have endeavoured to prove from what remains we have of our ancient writers. 2d. Such as Boece and Buchanan have published it, which is what I call the remote or high antiquities of the Scots in Britain.

The first scheme may be reduced to these four heads: 1st. That the Scots were not settled even in Ireland till about or after the times of the incarnation.¹ 2d. That the Scots were not settled in Britain till about the third age of Christianity.² 3d. That the Scots in Britain had no sovereign kings of their own nation before Fergus, son of Erch;³ and that the reign of Fergus, son of Erch, and by consequence the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in Britain, is to be placed no higher than about the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century.⁴

The second and opposite scheme, or that of the Scotish high antiquities, may be reduced to the following heads:—1st. The Scotish monarchy in Ireland began by Simon Breac, about six hundred years before the incarnation. 2d. The Scots came to Britain about four hundred years before the incarnation. 3d. The Scots in Britain had kings before the incarnation, and their monarchy began three hundred and thirty years before the birth of Christ. 4th. Fergus, the son of Feredac or Fercart, was the first king of the Scots in Britain, and had about thirty-eight kings his successors, who reigned during about seven hundred years in the north of Britain, till the overthrow of the Scotish monarchy about the end of the fourth century; of each of which kings' reigns our modern historians give a circumstantial chronological account. 5th. Fergus, the son of Erch, called Fergus II., restored the Scotish monarchy, and began his reign about the beginning of the fifth century, A.D. 403.

To come, then, to the purpose, and describe the several additions and alterations that were made in different ages, by different hands and occasions, in the first simple scheme of the Scotish antiquities before Fergus, son of Erch, till they grew up into that high fabric whereof Fordun laid the plan, which Boece finished, and Buchanan adorned, I must, in the first place, do that justice to my countrymen to acknowledge that, except in the last additions, whereof the first authors, I mean of the books under the name of *Veremund*, etc., were no doubt guilty of forgery (as I have shown elsewhere);⁵—all the rest of the additions or alterations were made rather out of ignorance of

¹ *Vide* Dissert. I. p. 226, etc., and p. 279, etc.

² *Supra*, p. 346, etc.

³ *Ibid.* p. 360.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 372. . .

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 140, etc.

ancient history, and too great credulity, from the motive of raising the honour and prerogatives of their country beyond others, and rather upon conjectures and grounds that seemed at least probable enough, in the several occasions and circumstances that gave rise to them, than upon any formed design to alter the truth or to invent. And if we consider with more attention the several degrees of growth of these high antiquities, in the hands of our writers of different ages, we will find that each new addition to the first invention of them (which was wholly due to the bards) was in some manner but a consequence of the former; each new one leaving, as it were, behind it a demand of a new supplement, till the fabric of these high antiquities was completed, by degrees, in the order and with the dimensions in which our modern historians present it.

SEC. I.—*First step or foundation of the high Antiquities of the Scots in Britain: the opinion of the Scots having been settled in Ireland several Ages before the Incarnation.*

This first step, or the first invention, is wholly due to the bards in Ireland. The Scots being settled there about or after the times of the incarnation, and becoming the leading men in that island, and being by degrees cemented into one body of people with the ancient inhabitants, the time of their first coming in wore out of the memory of men in some ages (and a few ages sufficed for that in a country where as yet there was no use of letters, nor written records), it is like that the bards, to flatter the Scots in Ireland, as the governing party, and gain their favour and rewards, began to set them out in their rhythms as very ancient inhabitants of the island, come into it time out of mind; and having afterwards, as we have observed, especially after they had some knowledge of the Scripture, gotten some hints of long genealogies, they drew up genealogies for the leading men of the Scots, and led them up, first, to the supposed first heroes and founders of the Irish, and from thence up to Noah and Adam. Having also gotten some notion of chronology, they seem to have at first fixed the time of the coming in of the Scots to about six or seven hundred years before the incarnation, as we have elsewhere shown; and the Scots in Britain, having received these first drafts of the genealogy and chronology from the Irish, have preserved them much in the same state in which they were at first broached, having no national concern, as the Irish had, to alter¹ them, in order to make their settlement in Ireland and their monarchy remount to a higher antiquity.

¹ *Supra*, p. 265, etc.

SEC. II.—*The Settlement of the Scots in Britain placed before the Incarnation, but no Kings till Fergus, son of Erch.*

The story of the Scots' settlement in Ireland six or seven hundred years before the incarnation being generally received, it was the more easy to think that their first settlement in Britain was also very ancient; that the Scots coming in at first to Britain by degrees, insensibly, and in small numbers, and not in bodies of men, the memory of the time of the coming in of the first of them might in some ages be quite worn out. And they being originally the same people with the Scots in Ireland, and the ancient settlement of these last in Ireland being generally received, it was the more likely that the settlement of those in Britain must have been ancient also, that the passage from Ireland, first to the western islands, or to Kintyre, Lorn, Argyle, and other western coasts of Britain, the first possession of the Scots in this island, was more short and easy.

Now the first Scots being come into Britain, as we suppose, in the third age¹ of Christianity, though they made no figure there till the fourth, their descendants in the seventh or eighth age, after ten or twelve generations, ignorant of the precise time of their coming in, and knowing only that they were settled in Britain time out of mind, would naturally be inclined rather to augment than diminish their antiquity in the seats which they then enjoyed (ancient possession being an honourable title) when the question was about the time of their settlement. Wherefore we must not wonder that Bede, who had his informations from some Scotish monks in the eighth age, when he wrote his history, seems to have believed, on their credit, that the Scots² were settled before the times of the incarnation, not only in Ireland, but even in Britain; and for the same reason Nennius³ also, a British writer of the ninth age, seems to place the coming in of the Scots to Dalriad (the ancient name of their possessions in Britain) about five hundred years before the incarnation, that is, about an age or two after their first coming to Ireland, according to the Irish tradition, not as yet altered in his time.

This opinion of the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, being once received among them, was too honourable to be abandoned, and much more likely to be improved than examined in such ages as the ninth, tenth, and eleventh; and accordingly we find that, in the twelfth and thirteenth following ages, it was not only held among the Scots as certain, but the time of the Scots first coming into Britain condescended

¹ *Supra*, p. 346, etc.

² Bed. lib. 1, c. 1.

³ Nennius, c. 9.

upon to have been about the year four hundred and forty-three before the incarnation, according to the Latin chronicle¹ in verse, in the following passage:—

‘Bis bis centeno quater endeca, sed minus uno
Anno, quo sumpsit primos Ergadie Scotos
Ut referunt isti fuit incarnatio Christi,’ etc.

And here I cannot but take notice of a mistake (I shall give it no other name, out of respect to so truly learned a person) that Usher² and others, copying after him, to bring down as low as they can the settlement of the Scots in Britain, have fallen into, in applying the number of four hundred and forty-three years contained in these verses to the times posterior to the incarnation; whereas by a little attention to what goes before and what follows after these verses in this short chronicle, it would have clearly appeared that the author's meaning was, that the Scots were settled in Britain four hundred and forty-three years before the incarnation. I say, four hundred and forty-three years, and not four hundred and thirty-nine. For in all the best copies of this chronicle, such as that in the *Scotichronicon* or *Black Book of Pastly*, in the king's library at London, in the *Scotichronicons* of the College of Edinburgh, in that of Panmure, and in that of the Scottish college of Paris, there is, ‘Bis bis centeno quater (endeca) sed minus uno,’ etc., and not ‘quater & deca,’ etc., as it seems Usher's copy had it. This is further confirmed by the following more ancient Scottish writers, such as Winton and Gray, who both of them copied from the records of St. Andrews, and both place the first settlement of the Scots in Britain about four hundred and forty-three years before the incarnation.

But though the author of this chronicle, and other writers about this time, were persuaded of this ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, yet not only this author hath not a word of any kings of the Scots before Fergus, son of Erch, but, on the contrary, he tells us plainly that the Scots lived long in Britain before they had kings, and both he and all the remains of our ancient histories, and all our other writers of the thirteenth age, down to our debates about the independency of Scotland with Edward I. before Pope Boniface VIII., are positive that the Scots had at least no sovereign kings of their own nation in Britain before King Fergus, son of Erch, and all of them place him the first monarch of the Scots in Britain, as we have shown elsewhere.³

¹ Append. No. 6, c. 6.

² Brit. Eccl. Antiq. p. 312.

³ *Supra*, p. 360.

SEC. III.—First rise or origin of the opinion of Ancient Kings of the Scots in Britain before the Incarnation, but nothing yet determined as to their number and names.

We have given some account in another place¹ upon what occasion the opinion of ancient Scotish kings in Britain was at first started at the debates with King Edward I. before the Pope about our independencies, contained in the two records set down at length by the best continuators of Fordun; whereof the one is the memorial² sent by the States of Scotland to their three deputies at the Court of Rome, the other is the memorial³ or process of Baldred Bisset, the chief of these deputies, both given in to the Pope, A.D. 1301. We have given a full account of them in the place above mentioned.

In these debates, as hath been observed, our deputies, like skilful and zealous advocates in a cause of the highest importance to their country, made use of all sort of arguments to defend it. They proved our independency by what could be found in the country of ancient records. They endeavoured to raise, in the eyes of the Pope and Court of Rome, a high opinion of the Scotish nation, and of its prerogatives above the English, by the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain,—which in those days they made no doubt of, having then for several ages been generally received by them,—from their having received Christianity long before the English or Saxons, from their having still preserved their freedom and kept possession of the same territories in the north of Britain for so many ages, notwithstanding their being attacked by so many enemies; whilst the south of Britain, or England, had so often lost its freedom, and been so frequently subjected to new masters—Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans.

But King Edward I., in his letter to the Pope, having brought his succession and pretended superiority over Scotland down from Brutus, Loerinus, and the ancient British kings, which, however fabulous, passed current in those days, the Scots would not be behindhand with him in that neither; and therefore having, as they believed, probable grounds to go upon, the advocates of the Scots advance before the Pope that the Scots had also a succession of ancient kings from before the incarnation. This is indeed the first time we hear of it, but the Scotish deputies advanced it with the greater confidence that, besides the pressing occasion they had for it, in that juncture, not to have the Scots thought any ways inferior to the English in so honourable a prerogative as that of an ancient monarchy—

¹ *Supra*, p. 337.

² *Fordun.* edit. Tho. Hearne, p. 1835.

³ *Ibid.* p. 1883.

besides this, the thing in itself seemed probable enough in those days.

For to say nothing here of our kings being descended, time out of mind, from the Pictish kings, in whose right they had succeeded, it was now some ages since the opinion of the Scots, their having been settled four or five hundred years in Britain before the incarnation, and so about nine hundred years before the reign of Fergus, son of Erch, was generally received, as we have shown,¹ among the Scots. Now that the Scots, a people almost always at war with their neighbours, could be in Britain about eight or nine hundred years, a headless people, and without a king, was a thing that seemed no ways probable, or rather almost entirely incredible.

Besides, that this memorial of the Scots was drawn up in great haste (*cum festinatione*) in Scotland, so that they had not leisure to examine things maturely, or to consult those that were most versed in the antiquities of the nation, but were obliged to set down such notions of them as their memory or popular traditions could furnish them, or rather their secretaries, and at the same time to give them the most favourable turn for the support of their cause that they could think of. And upon the whole, considering the ignorance the Scots were in (since the destruction or carrying off the ancient documents of their history), the persuasion they were in of their ancient settlement in Britain, and the little probability there was that they could have been so many ages in Britain without kings, I can scarce doubt but their deputies, and those that drew up their memorials, had persuaded themselves that the Scots had a succession of kings from their first settlement. And this came afterwards to be a common opinion among them, but without condescending as yet upon their names, not even upon that of the first king or founder, till Fordun's chronicle was published and universally received in the fifteenth century.

But as to Baldred Bisset, one of the deputies, his telling the Pope in his memorial² that the Scots had thirty-six Catholic or Christian kings before the English were converted to Christianity,—this, I own, is a stretch I cannot fathom or guess at the grounds on which he went, except that it shows that he knew nothing yet certain in particular about the beginning of the monarchy or Christianity among the Scots. For at that rate the Scots would have had Christian kings before the times of Christianity; since, even in Boece's account, Metellan, whom he places about the time of the incarnation, was but the thirty-second king upwards from King Aydan, in whose time the gospel was preached to the Saxons or English.

¹ *Supra*, p. 379.

² Fordun, edit. Hearne, p. 887.

Yet there is another Scotish writer in these dark times, mentioned by the continuators of Fordun,¹ that surpasseth in the antiquity of the Scotish monarchy even Baldred's memorial; for he tells us that the Scots had twenty-three kings before the Piets came into Britain, which, according to this writer's aeeounts, happened above two hundred years before the incarnation. So that according to him, the beginning of the Scotish monarchy would be placed about six or seven hundred years before the incarnation, since twenty-three of our kings' reigns, in no age or writer, take up less than betwixt four and five hundred years.

But it is easy to observe from these high flights and incredible accounts, that when the first mention of these ancient kings before Fergus, son of Ere, began (that is, at the end of the thirteenth or about the beginning of the fourteenth age), there was nothing yet fixed or agreed on about them; and those ineredible accounts given by those who first mention them insinuate plainly enough that the opinion was as yet new and undigested, advanced only at a venture, in a neessary juneture, to serve a turn. It required time to make it ripen, and the labours of posterior writers to digest it, to fix the date of the monarchy, the number of kings, their names—at least that of the first and founder. All this was the work of time. But the fabric was now begun; we shall see there wanted not hands, as occasion offered, to finish it piecemeal.

SEC. IV.—*The number of those Ancient Kings first mentioned, but no account as yet of their names, not even that of the first King or Founder of the Monarchy, nor the time of the beginning of the Monarchy as yet fixed.*

The next step, then, of the growth of our remote antiquities was the fixing the number of these ancient kings. This we have for the first time advanced transiently, rather than determined (for posterior writers stuck not by it), about twenty years after the first mention of them; we have it, I say, in the famous letter of our Scotish nobility, under King Robert the Bruce, to Pope John xxii., A.D. 1320. There they tell the Pope that King Robert was the hundred and thirteenth king of the Scots. Now he being in reality but our fifty-third king from Fergus, son of Ere, and even in Fordun's and the vulgar aeeount but the fifty-seventh from this Fergus, they must have counted fifty-six kings before this Fergus II., and that is about sixteen kings more than Boece, Buehanan, and our other modern writers suppose, who reckon only thirty-nine kings in all before this Fergus.

¹ Scotichron. lib. 4, c. 10.

As for this number of one hundred and thirteen kings, it may be the nobility, or rather their secretary, reckoned all at once both the ancient kings of the Piets and those of the Scots, in the number of their present kings' ancestors; as they might very well do, since he was descended of them both, and was possessed of both their rights. The Pictish kings, according to the best accounts of them given by the Scots (such as that of the register of St. Andrews), being sixty in number, and those in the Scotish line, from Fergus, son of Erch, till Robert Bruce, making, according to our most ancient chronologists, just the number of fifty-three, both these together made exactly that of one hundred and thirteen kings, according to this letter.

But if any will insist rigorously upon the expression of this letter of the nobility (*de ipsorum (Scotorum) regali prosapia, nullo alienigena interveniente*), and conclude from thence that all these kings must have been of the Scotish race or line, I offer them another conjecture for verifying the expression of the letter, and finding out the hundred and thirteen kings.

Simon Breac was looked upon by all the Scots, for many ages before, as their leader from Spain, who brought the fatal stone along with him, and first founded a monarchy of the Scotish nation. Now the Scots, in their letter to the Pope, take not the least notice of the Scots coming from Spain, first to Ireland, and thence to the north-west of Britain, but suppose that the Scots came straight from Spain to Britain, and possessed themselves of these territories in the west of Britain where they first settled, and which they still enjoyed with the accession of the Pictish dominions.

Now though the Scotish nobility, or their secretary, do not expressly name Simon Breac in this letter, yet he being reputed in these times their leader from Spain, and first monarch of the Scots, it is like the secretary may have looked upon the fifty-four or fifty-five descents or names in the old genealogy, from Simon till Fergus, son of Erch, as so many kings descended of Simon, the first Scotish king in these parts. And this confounding the descents of the genealogy with the succession or reigns of kings ought not to seem extraordinary in those times of ignorance, since the learned Dr. Stillingfleet,¹ in our time, hath fallen into the same mistake in taking a genealogical line for a succession of kings. Now the Scots, in their letter to the Pope, taking the fifty-five names or descents in the genealogical line from Simon till Fergus, son of Erch, for fifty-five kings, and these added to the fifty-eight kings in the common account from Fergus, son of Erch, down till Robert the Bruce, both together make exactly the number of one hundred and

¹ Stillingfleet, Orig. Britan. Praef. p. 10, etc.

thirteen kings, including King Robert. If these conjectures for the number of one hundred and thirteen kings, mentioned by the nobility, do not please, I leave to others to find out more likely grounds for it.

However, neither in this letter, nor in any piece now extant of those times, do we find the names of these kings, not so much as that of the first or founder, different from Simon Breac; for as to Fergus, son of Ferchard, his being called the first king of the Scots in Albany, in the copy we have from Fordun and his continuators of the genealogy of our kings, in the end of King David's life,¹ and in that recited by the Highlander at the coronation of King Alexander III., it cannot be doubted of but these words, Fergus first king of the Scots in Albany, meaning Fergus, son of Ferchard, are not of these times, nor of the first hand, but are a bare interpolation of Fordun or of his continuators, according to their custom of adapting ancient historical pieces to the systems they had formed to themselves. For, in all the genuine copies of this genealogy before Fordun, such as that of King William's time, set down here in the appendix, No. 4, as well as in that of Ralph de Diceto, dean of London, in the same age, and in Winton's copy, who lived in Fordun's time, and in that of Mr. James Gray, who lived after Fordun, both which were taken from the ancient records of St. Andrews,—in all these, I say, there is never a word of this Fergus, son of Ferchard, his being first king of Albany, or a king at all, but his bare name is ranked with the rest of the names of that genealogy, without the least mark of distinction.

And neither in the memorials and process of Baldred, and of the other Scottish deputies, given in by the Scots, A.D. 1301, or in the letter to the Pope, A.D. 1320, where we have the first mention of the number of these ancient kings, is there the least word of Fergus I. or of any one of these first kings by name; only the instructions of the States of Scotland, A.D. 1301, mention over and again one Erch as the father of our kings. 1st. They bring him in as son to Gatheyl and Scota, as first of our kings² at the settlement of the Scots in Britain, and as giving his name with that of his father, as they call him, Gathel, joined in one name, Ercgatheyyl, to the country in Britain which they first possessed. 2d. They place him again a king of the Scots,³ Erch, son to Echad or Ethod, and brother to Eugenius, at the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, about the time the monarchy is supposed by our modern writers to have been restored by Fergus, son of Erch. This double mention of Erch as the stock of our kings is remarkable, and shows us how

¹ Fordun, edit. Hearne, lib. 5, c. 50, pp. 487, 760.

² Ibid. p. 847.

³ Ibid. p. 854.

much the tradition of our kings being descended of Erch, or rather of Fergus, son of Erch, was fixed in the minds of the Scots at that time, and that the notion of Fergus, son of Ferchard, as our first king, was not yet known or invented.

Before we enter upon the improvements made in our high antiquities by John Fordun, who first reduced them to a system and order, we must, of course, set down what Winton, prior of Lochleven, says of them in his chronicle. We have given account of Winton¹ among the rest of our writers. And though he wrote only some few years after Fordun, yet it is certain he had never seen John Fordun's chronicle, which, it appears, was not published by Bowmaker, abbot of Inchcolm, till about the year 1448, and that after Winton's time. So Winton, knowing nothing of Fordun's new systems, was still much in the same darkness and uncertainty about our high antiquities as the rest of the nation were in the beginning of the fourteenth age. But having made it his business to inquire into our history, and living at the end of the fourteenth age, and beginning of the fifteenth, we may learn from him what progress the opinions already received about our ancient settlement and antiquity of the Scottish monarchy in Britain had made, during the course of that fourteenth age, independently of John Fordun's labours, and what the common opinion and sense of the Scots was upon these heads before John Fordun's system of our history was published.

Winton believed, according to the tradition received many ages before, that the Scots were settled in Britain before the incarnation; and he fixes the epoch of their coming in about the year four hundred and forty-three before the birth of Christ, as the short Latin chronicle in rhythm had done. And as to the opinion of the Scots having had kings before the Picts, or from about the time of their first settlement in Britain, first started, as we have observed, at the debate with King Edward I., this opinion seeming so honourable to the nation, and having had in Winton's time about a whole age to ripen, and being then almost generally received among the Scots, Winton goes into it heartily at first. But then, being at the same time so fully persuaded that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king of the Scots that he repeats² it over and over three or four several times in his chronicle, and finding, on the other hand, that there were only ten³ generations or descents betwixt Fergus, son of Erch, and Kenneth MacAlpin, who began his reign A.D. 842, and overcame the Picts, and that it was impossible that these ten generations could last twelve hundred years, as they must have

¹ *Supra*, p. 333.

² Winton's Chronicle, ms. in Bibl. Cotton. fol. 30, 37, 43.

³ Appendix, No. 7.

done if Fergus, son of Erch, had begun to reign over the Scots from their first settlement in Britain, in his account more than four hundred years before the incarnation,—Winton is at last with reluctance forced to part with the notion of the Scots having had a king from their first settlement; and yet being sure that the name of their first king was Fergus, son of Erch (whom he calls always Erth, as it was the custom of that age to write), as it was true, he at last begins first to doubt, and then inclines to believe, that King Fergus' reign was not of so old date, and, in short, leaves the difficulty to be resolved by others.

It is evident by the perplexity Winton was in to reconcile Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots, with the notion of kings of Scots from their first settlement before the incarnation, and before the Picts, that Winton knew nothing of any other King Fergus but Fergus, son of Erch, who was but ten generations before Kenneth MacAlpin; and that in Winton's days, that is, about the end of the fourteenth age, Fergus, son of Feradac or Ferchart, called King Fergus I., was not as yet known as a king of Scots, either by Winton or commonly among the Scots; and by consequence, that Fordun's chronicle, where we meet for the first time with the distinction of two kings, first and second, of the name of Fergus, was not yet generally known in the kingdom, nor had ever been seen by Winton, having never been published, in all appearance, till it came out with additions during the reign of King James II., as hath been already remarked.

And as to Winton, he was so far from looking on Fergus or (as he calls him, with the oldest copies of the genealogy) Fergo or Forco, son of Feradach, as the first king, or a king at all, of the Scots, that he sets down his name as all the oldest copies of the genealogy do, confusedly among the rest of the names¹ of that genealogy of our kings, without taking the least notice of him more than of the rest. Now had Winton gotten but a hint of this first Fergus, son of Ferchard, his having been a king of Scots, he had instantly disentangled himself, and had been able to reconcile his belief of the Scots having been settled four hundred years before the incarnation with their having had kings, and the first of them a Fergus, from the beginning (and so to have raised their antiquity higher than that of the Picts, which he and our other writers chiefly aimed at), since there were no less than forty-five generations betwixt this first Fergus, son of Ferchard, and Kenneth MacAlpin, which were more than enough to fill up twelve hundred years, and so would have reconciled all matters, and solved all Winton's difficulties. But this discovery was left to Fordun, whose labours in advancing

¹ Winton, Book iii. fol. 30, ms. Colon.—Bibl. Reg. Lond. lib. 3, c. 10.

the fabric of our remote antiquities, and giving them a form, require to be treated of at more length.

SEC. V.—*John Fordun's labours in the remote Antiquities of the Scots. These Antiquities reduced into a fixed plan and chronological order.*

We have already¹ given a general account of John Fordun, and more than once spoken of his labours in the Scottish history; we are now to treat of his bringing it to that fixed plan and order which hath been followed by all our later writers, especially in what concerns our high antiquities, or the history of the Scots before Fergus, son of Erch, commonly called Fergus II.

To do justice to Fordun, it appears by what we have said elsewhere of him, that none ever applied to history with more zeal for his country, nor with a better intention, than Fordun, nor hath been at greater pains to find out materials, or to digest them in a more regular form, considering the times in which he wrote. For as to the substance of his chronicle, it must be considered that Fordun wrote in an age when there was little or no critical learning, and very little distinction made betwixt certain and fabulous monuments of history; when uncertain popular traditions and dubious legends, for want of better materials, were often employed as documents of history; when certain national preventions in favour of our remote antiquities ran so high, that a mistaken zeal for what was thought in those days honourable to the country, and an apprehension to shock the better part of the nation, hindered Fordun from discussing matters, and so overswayed him, as it hath done many others, that he believed that the dignity of the crown and kingdom was concerned in supporting by all means the current popular traditions of our remote antiquities, which were become daily more in vogue since the debates about our independency with King Edward I.

Hence it happened that the antiquities of the Scots made a new and considerable progress and figure in passing through Fordun's hands. For what had been only advanced by conjecture in times past, especially at the debate about the independency, and that only to serve a turn, and on bare probabilities, or advanced confusedly in different former ages without order and connection, as well as all the popular traditions about the ancient settlement of the Scots in Britain, the antiquities of the monarchy, etc.,—all this was by Fordun digested into a following series of history, reduced to chronological order, and supported with all the documents he had met with in his

¹ *Supra*, pp. 123, 135, 343, etc.

searches fit for his purpose ; documents, indeed, much of the same character as the facts they were brought to support, but documents after all, and vouchers, much of the same nature and credit as those brought by the writers of our neighbouring countries for antiquities of the same nature,—by the British or Welsh for their Brutus, and the long tract of his ancient successors ; by the Irish for their Milesius and his successors before Christianity, for their ancient literature, and their other remote antiquities.

We are now to consider Fordun's performances more in detail, the grounds he had to go upon, the method which he followed, and the means he was obliged to make use of, to put in a more regular order the new plan of the fabric of our remote antiquities, contained in the first, but chiefly in the second, and beginning of the third book of his chronicle.

As to his first book, containing the story of the Scotish high antiquities from Geythelos or Gathelus, till Fergus, son of Ferchart, the substance of that (except what concerned Fergus as a king) had been advanced, and by degrees received among the Scots long before Fordun, as we have already observed.¹ And Fordun only enlarged on the same bottom, improved into better order these vulgar traditions, and fixed them to certain periods of chronology. It is chiefly in the last chapters of his first book, in his second, and in the first chapter of the third, that the Scotish remote antiquities received from him their greatest increase and improvement, and were brought to a more regular form and consistency.

We have seen, in the four foregoing paragraphs, the several steps or degrees of the growth of those antiquities, which, like a large fabric, received new dimensions or additions from the several ages and different hands through which they had passed, but nothing fixed or regular till Fordun. The first foundation of them, to wit, the opinion of the Scots, their having been settled in Ireland long before the incarnation, had been laid many ages ago. The first superstructure upon that, to wit, of the Scots having been settled in Britain about four hundred years before the incarnation, was raised before the twelfth age. The first additions to that, to wit, of the Scots in Britain, their having had kings from their first settlement, was first started at our debates with King Edward I. about independency, and by the circumstances of the times and other reasons, mentioned already in its proper place, soon gained credit among the Scots. The number of their ancient kings was named by conjecture, about twenty years afterwards, in the famous letter of the Scots nobility to Pope John XXII.

¹ *Supra*, pp. 379, 380.

It remained now for Fordun's task in this fabric, 1st. To reduce former superstructures into symmetry, by digesting the whole into distinct epochs and a chronological order. 2d. To fix a certain epoch for the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in Britain. 3d. To reduce the number of their ancient kings within a more plausible compass, to wit, to that of forty-five. 4th. To assign their names. 5th. At least to give us the name of the first king and founder of the monarchy. 6th. To give a chronological account of their reigns, at least such as he had given of the Picts, and as he gave afterwards of the Scotish kings from Fergus II. downwards. 7th. In order to support the credit of the story of the kings of Scots in Britain before Fergus, son of Erch, against the plain testimonies of all the above-mentioned remains of ancient monuments of the Scots before the twelfth age, and the debates about our independency with Edward I., and others of a like purport, Fordun had to give a plausible reason why in all these ancient remains of our history, Fergus, son of Erch, is reckoned the first king of the Scots in Britain; which assertion alone, if not obviated or cleared, overturns at once all the system of the high antiquities of the Scots, or of their forty or forty-five kings before Fergus, son of Erch, or Fergus II. Now Fordun, being persuaded of the truth of this system, looked upon all that he met with of these remains contrary to it, in his searches, barely as objections or difficulties, which he had to answer or remove by explications or distinctions. We have already had occasion to observe one means made use of by Fordun to that purpose; but another and more universal answer was to find out or discover a dissolution of the ancient Scotish monarchy, founded by Fergus I., son of Ferchard, and continued down till it was ruined, towards the end of the fourth age of Christianity, and a new erection or foundation of it by Fergus II., son of Erch, in the beginning of the fifth age, by which this Fergus, son of Erch, might be justly called the first king of the Scots, to wit, after the restoration of the monarchy.

We are now to give an account of Fordun's proceedings in the execution of this task, consisting of the seven heads above mentioned. But before I enter upon that, it is of importance both for this, and for other parts of Fordun's chronicle, to observe that the chief means that Fordun made use of to compass his design was to suppose as certain grounds or vouchers of history, not to be called in question, and that required no further proof, the popular opinions or traditions received before his time among the Scots concerning their antiquities; and from these opinions, as from fixed principles, without further examining the grounds of them, Fordun's method was to draw

other historical inferences, that seemed honourable to the country and natural consequences of these popular opinions and traditions already in vogue.

Before I proceed to the use and application of this method of Fordun's in forming his new system of our history, in order to make it be more fully understood, I shall give here, by the way, a remarkable example of Fordun's proceeding by it in a matter of very great importance, though of a different nature, and which more properly belongs to the second part of this essay, but which hath had a surprising influence upon the civil as well as ecclesiastical state of Scotland, which it was not possible for Fordun to foresee.

Fordun found the opinion of the Scots having been settled in the north of Britain some ages before the incarnation received as a certain historical fact many ages before his time ; and that of an ancient Christianity among these Scots, being no less honourable to the nation, had been also received among them long before Fordun's days, though he is the first that we know of who assigned to the conversion of the Scots the fixed date of A.D. 203, and that quotes for this the verses :

‘Christi transactis tribus annis atque ducentis
Scotia catholicae cœpit habere fidem.
Roma Victore primo papa residente
Principe Severo martyr et occubuit.’

And though the expression ‘Victore primo’ demonstrates that those verses are posterior to the eleventh age, when Pope Victor II. lived, and their barbarous composition shows that they are yet later, yet they passed for good authority in Fordun's time, and apparently before it.

Now those two facts of the early settlement and early conversion of the Scots, being received as historical truths that nobody called in question when Fordun wrote, he meets in Bede and Sigibert with the famous passage of Prosper's chronicle, bearing that more than two hundred years after this first supposed conversion of the Scots, A.D. 431,¹ Palladius was ordained by Pope Celestine, and sent the first bishop to the Scots who believed in Christ. Fordun made no doubt but these Scots believing in Christ, ‘credentes in Christum,’ were the Scots of Britain. They had been, in his opinion, converted two hundred years before, and St. Patrick was not yet sent to convert the Scots of Ireland. The consequence in Fordun's judgment seemed evident, that during the two first ages of the Christianity of the Scots, from A.D. 203 till A.D. 431, when Palladius the first bishop was sent to them, the Scots had lived

¹ ‘Ad Scottos in Christum credentes ordinatur a papa Cælestino Palladius, et primus episcopus mittitur.’—*Prosp. Chron.*

without bishops ; and since they had persevered in the profession of Christianity, being still ‘*credentes in Christum*,’ and that the profession of Christianity could not be kept up during all that time without doctors of faith, and pastors or ministers of the word and sacraments ; and it being a certain truth, that in the absence or default of bishops, none were qualified to exercise those sacred functions but priests or monks elevated to the dignity of priesthood,—from all this, as from unquestionable principles, in Fordun’s judgment, he draws this famous conclusion, that¹ before Palladius’ coming, the Scots had for doctors of faith and ministers of the sacraments, priests only and monks following the rite of the primitive church.

This passage of Fordun, at the new reformation of Scotland, became the corner-stone or fundamental charter of Presbyterian government in that kingdom, as containing the most ancient account of church government, from the first establishment of the Christian religion among the Scots. The same passage hath been ever since appealed to, by the successors of our first Reformers, in all the debates they have had with the episcopal party concerning the government of the church. It hath also been employed by the most learned antagonists of episcopal government among foreigners as one of their principal arguments ; for, as a learned bishop² of the Church of England hath observed, ‘ In that laborious collection of Blondel, under the title of an apology for St. Hierome, that writer, with all his vast reading, could not find one undoubted example of a church of the presbyterian way in ancient times, but only that of the Scots.’

We may have occasion in the second part of this essay to discuss this passage more fully, together with those of Bede concerning St. Columba, and those of the Keledees, which are brought to strengthen Fordun’s passage ; but to say a word here of this last will not be out of the way, since it will serve to make Fordun’s method to be more fully understood.

This famous passage of Fordun, ‘*ante cujus [Palladii] adventum*,’ etc., is a consequence which Fordun draws from two premises, whereof the one is absolutely groundless, and the other at least extremely dubious, though both of them were held for certain by Fordun. The first is, that the Scots in Britain were converted to Christianity A.D. 203. But we have no ground to believe that the Scots were come into Britain A.D. 203, as hath been already shown, and that the most that can be advanced

¹ ‘*Ante cujus [Palladii] adventum, habebant Scotti fidei doctores, ac sacramentorum ministrae, presbyteros solummodo, vel monachos, ritum sequentes ecclesiae primitiae.*’—*Fordun*, lib. 3, c. 8, edit. Th. Hearne, p. 184.

² Bp. of St. Asaph’s Governm. of the Ch. of G. B., preface, p. 5.

with any probability or ground, is that the Scots began during the third age to come over from Ireland into Britain, under their first leader, Eocha Riada, called Reuda by Bede. So there could be no conversion of the Scots A.D. 203, in Britain, where they were not as yet settled; nor, by consequence, any occasion as yet for pastors or ministers of any kind among them. So all the inferences drawn from Fordun's passage, 'ante cujus,' etc., being built on the supposition of a profession of Christianity or Christian church among the Scots during above two hundred years before the mission of Palladius, are absolutely groundless.

The other premise supposed by Fordun is, that the Scots to whom Palladius was sent the first bishop, A.D. 431, by Pope Celestine, were the Scots of Britain. It may indeed be said, that Palladius was sent to the Scots in general, that is, to the nation of the Scots wherever they were settled, and so those of Britain might be comprehended; and it is not unlike, as we may have occasion to observe elsewhere, that this holy bishop, not being well received by the Scots of Ireland, and coming over to Britain, where he died among the Picts, may have probably announced the gospel to the Scots in Britain; but as the question is here of his mission and destination by Pope Celestine, it appears by another passage of St. Prosper, who relates this mission, that Palladius' mission regarded mainly the Scots in Ireland. For Prosper¹ seems visibly to distinguish the island to which Palladius was sent, as being a barbarous island, that is, in Prosper's language, an island that had never been subject to nor cultivated by the Romans, from Britain, which he calls a Roman island, because the far greatest part of it (and among the rest, those provinces of Scotland that lie to the south of the friths) had been civilised by the Roman discipline and polity.

But I add further, that giving and not granting that this conclusion of Fordun, 'ante cujus [Palladii] adventum,' etc., had been well drawn in the sense that Fordun meant it, the inference that the anti-episcopal writers draw from it, to wit, that before Palladius' mission there was during two hundred years in Scotland a succession of pastors, or ministers of the word and sacraments, who had no episcopal ordination, and none but that of laymen or simple presbyters,—this inference is absolutely groundless, for neither Fordun himself, who knew that the doctrine of presbyterian parity was contrary to that of the church of all ages, and had been lately condemned in his own

¹ 'Nec Segniore cura hoc ab eodem morbo [Pelagianismi] Britannias liberavit [Cælestinus] quando quosdam inimicos gratia solum sue originis occupantes, etiam ab illo secreto exclusit oceani: et ordinato Scotis episcopo, dum Romanam insulam studet servare catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram Christianam.'—Prosper contra Collator, c. 41.

time among the propositions of Wickliff, could ever entertain any such imagination, no more than Major, Boece, Lesly, etc., who copied after him; but all that Fordun and these other Roman Catholic writers understood or could understand by the expression, ‘ante ejus,’ etc., was, that though the Scots had, as they believed, received Christianity A.D. 203, yet they had not a proper bishop sent to them, or residing among them, till the coming of Palladius, A.D. 431, and so the Christian Scots had been obliged till then to content themselves with priests and monks, elevated to the dignity of priesthood by the neighbouring or foreign bishops. But to conclude from that passage of Fordun, as the anti-episcopal writers do, that because (according to Fordun) these Scots Christians had no proper bishop as yet sent to them till two hundred years after their first conversion, that therefore they had no other ministers of the word and sacraments but nominal priests or monks, who took upon themselves the sacred functions without episcopal or any other ordination but that of laymen or presbyters, is no less ridiculous than if one should conclude that the clergy or regular priests, who were the only ministers of the word and sacraments among the Roman Catholics in Scotland for more than one hundred years after the Reformation, had no other ordination but what they gave to one another, because during all that time there was no bishop of their communion residing in Scotland.

As to the expression of Prosper, ‘ad Scotos credentes in Christum,’ that Palladius was sent to the Scots who believed in Christ, from which some conclude that the Scots were Christians before the coming of Palladius. But that no ways follows. That there were some Christians, or a beginning of Christianity, among the Scots, whether in Ireland or in Britain, when Palladius was sent, is very likely. They both dwelt in the neighbourhood of the Britains, who were early Christians, and either by commerce with them, or by Christian captives, which the Scots carried off frequently from among the Britains, there is all likelihood that before Palladius’ coming there were several Christians among the Scots, both in Ireland and in Britain; and it appears by ecclesiastical history, that it was the custom of the zealous bishops of the neighbourhood in ancient times, and more yet of the popes, to send in bishops to countries where there was already a beginning of Christianity, or a disposition towards it. And this is all that Prosper’s expression imports. But all this will be more fully discussed in its proper place.

Thus far only, by the way, as to this famous passage of Fordun, which hath been made use of by the anti-episcopal party in Scotland as one of the chief arguments for presby-

terian government from the times of the Reformation. So I return to Fordun, and to the particular account of his method of proceeding in the execution of his task, consisting of the seven above-mentioned heads.

As to the first head or part of his undertaking, to wit, the reducing to fixed epochs and the digesting into a chronological order the confused mass of the materials he had to work upon, consisting chiefly of popular traditions, legendary accounts about the Scottish antiquities, and of all that had been till his time advanced in different ages, and on different occasions, of what had passed among the Scots before the fourth and fifth ages of Christianity ;—as to all this, I say, we have already¹ seen that he reduced to a certain order of chronology both these high antiquities and the more modern and certain accounts of the Scots digested into fixed epochs, in the abstract we have given elsewhere of the several books of Fordun's chronicle.

We come, therefore, now to the second and fifth part of Fordun's task in the advancing the fabric of our remote antiquities, to wit, the fixing a certain epoch and precise year of the beginning of the Scottish monarchy before the incarnation, and the assigning the name of the first monarch and founder of it.

The tradition of the Scots' ancient settlement in Britain was universally received among them long before Fordun, and this settlement was supposed to have begun above four centuries before the incarnation ; but the first Scottish document we have now remaining of it, to wit, the short chronicle in Latin verse¹ or rhythms, is positive that they had no kings in the Scottish line till Fergus, son of Erch. This we have shown elsewhere, from all the monuments remaining of our ancient history before the year 1291. And the first mention we have of ancient kings, before Fergus, was at the debates in King Edward I.'s time. Though it is not improbable that there were some notions and uncertain opinions begun to grow up and spread among the Scots before these debates, that seeing a natural consequence of their being persuaded that the Scots were settled in Britain so long before the birth of Christ ; but till these debates I find no certain testimony of it in any monument of history I have yet met with.

However, the fact had been advanced, as we have seen, with great assurance in the memorials given in to Pope Boniface VIII. in the heat of the debate, and in the Scots nobility's letter to Pope John XXII., and had now passed current and been generally received among the Scots from the beginning of the fourteenth century till Fordun's time. So when he set about to write the

¹ *Supra*, p. 126, etc.

² Append. No. 6, c. 6.

history, he was no more master to contradict so plausible and so received an opinion, nor, indeed, disposed to call in doubt what he esteemed honourable to the nation, and so acceptable to his countrymen, as the opinion of so ancient a succession of kings. He made it rather his business to confirm it; and probably the chief end of his travels and searches was to find documents proper for proving that, and the other heads above mentioned.

To return, then, to the second and fifth heads, to wit, the fixing the epoch of the beginning of the Scots monarchy, and the person of the first king or founder. Hitherto we have seen nothing agreed on since the first mention of ancient kings. Neither the memorials, A.D. 1301, nor the letter to Pope John XXII., A.D. 1320, fix any epoch of the monarchy, nor so much as name the first king; and Winton, who, according to the truth of history, named him Fergus, Erch's son, as all Scottish writers before Fordun had done, not being able to reconcile that with the vulgar opinion of the antiquity of the monarchy, falls in contradiction with himself, and at last leaves the matter in doubt, as we have seen, to be resolved by others.

Fordun was the first, that we know of, who fixed the epoch of the monarchy to the year 330 before the incarnation, and who places Fergus, son of Ferchart, the first king of the Scots, and founder of the monarchy.

As to his fixing the beginning of the monarchy to the year 330 before the birth of Christ, besides his vouchers, whom we shall just now consider, I conceive one of his chief motives to fix on that year may have been this plausible conjecture, that finding, as we have seen, the first settlement of the Scots in Britain fixed before his time to the year 443, or thereabout, before the incarnation, he thought it was natural to allow them about one hundred years to increase their number and enlarge their bounds under the first leaders of their colonies from Ireland, before they got a king or monarch to whom all were subject. So that placing the beginning of the monarchy, and of the reign of their first king, about one hundred and ten years after their entry to Britain, that is, about the year 330 before the incarnation, was very probable, on the supposition already received, that the Scots came first to Britain about four hundred and forty years before it.

Fordun was also the first, that we know of, who raised to the dignity of first monarch of the Scots in Britain, Fergus, son of Ferchart or Feradach, whose name had, till Fordun's time, lain confusedly among the other names of the old genealogy of our kings, without any mark of distinction, or having ever been taken notice of, till Fordun added to his name, in the two copies

he gives of the genealogy, the quality of first king of Albany; for none of the copies antecedent to them, such as that in the appendix, No. 4, and that of Ralph de Diceto, both in the twelfth age, have that addition; nor even those that wrote after him without copying his chronicle, such as Winton and Gray, etc. Fordun was determined to make choice of this first Fergus, and set him up for the founder of the Scotish monarchy, as a natural consequence from what he found already received and believed by the Scots concerning these high antiquities; for that once supposed, nothing can be more plausible than the consequence he draws in favour of Fergus, son of Ferchart.

For, 1st, The opinion of the Scots having had kings some ages before the incarnation was generally received before Fordun's time, and having been made use of by the apologists of the Scots in the debate for the independency and dignity of the crown against King Edward I.'s pretensions, it was no more to be called in question in Fordun's days. 2d. It was unquestionably more certain, and more universally received, that the name of the first king of the Scots, and of the founder of their monarchy in Britain, was Fergus. All the Scots, till the fourteenth age, had believed that it was Fergus, son of Erch, as we have seen; but this could not agree with the monarchy's beginning some ages before the incarnation, since this Fergus, son of Erch, is placed, in the genealogy universally received, only ten generations or descents before Kenneth MacAlpin, who lived in the ninth age. This was a labyrinth out of which Winton could not extricate himself.

Fordun, who seems to have had more genius and learning, as well as more application, than Winton, found means to reconcile this contradiction; for, by looking back more attentively into the old genealogy, he discovered another Fergus, the son of Feradach, whom Winton, and all Scotish writers till Fordun, had passed over, without taking any more notice of him than of the rest of the old names in that genealogy; whereas Fordun, finding the first Fergus in the series of that genealogy about forty-five generations or descents before Kenneth Mac-Alpin, which, according to the vulgar reckoning of thirty years for each generation, amounted to a number of years sufficient to place this first Fergus at the beginning of the Scotish monarchy in his account, that is, three hundred and thirty years before the incarnation,—upon this discovery, Fordun naturally concluded that this Fergus, son of Feradach, was the Fergus, first king and founder of the Scotish monarchy, and by this means reconciled the then current tradition of the monarchy's beginning some ages before the incarnation, with its having had a Fergus for its founder and first king.

But because, by all the remains of the ancient history of the Scots, it appeared that the Scots had always held Fergus, son of Erch, for their first king, it was necessary that Fordun, in order to have his new scheme received with less difficulty, should in the first place bring some authorities to prove that the first king of the Scots was Fergus, son of Ferchart, and that the monarchy began three hundred and thirty years before the incarnation. 2d. That he should find some means to answer the objection drawn from the ancient monuments, in which Fergus, son of Erch, is called in express terms the first king of the Scots. We are, then, in the first place to hear his proofs for beginning the Scotish monarchy three hundred and thirty years before Christ, and Fergus, son of Ferchart, his being their first king. We shall afterwards relate the means he makes use of to obviate or explain the ancient testimonies of Fergus, son of Erch, his being the first king of the Scots.

His vouchers for the first are, first, these four Latin verses,—

‘Albion¹ in terris rex primus germine Scotus
Ipsorum turmis rubri tulit arma leonis
Fergusius fulvo Ferchart rugientis in arvo
Christum trecentis ter denis praeuit annis.’

Fordun doth not tell us whence he had those verses, whether from any former writer or chronicle, new or old; but though I well believe he found them made to his hand, yet it must be owned that the author of them, be who he will, must have been very little skilled if he intended that they should pass for ancient, since King Alexander II., in the thirteenth age, is the first of our kings in whose seal we find the lion rampant on his shield. For there are no arms on the seals of his predecessors, Duncan, Edgar, Alexander I., David I., Malcolm IV., nor on that of King William, and the blazoning, it is like, is yet posterior. So these verses are probably no older than the fourteenth age, when, as we have observed, these ancient kings before Fergus, son of Erch, were first mentioned; or rather these verses are only the productions of Fordun’s own time, since he is the first who calls Fergus, son of Ferchart, first king of the Scots.

Fordun’s second voucher is a legend of St. Congal, an Irish saint, which, he says, relates² that Fergus, son of Ferchart, brought with him the famous chair from Ireland to Scotland, and was crowned in it the first king of the Scots. It will no doubt at first appear a little surprising to find an account of this nature in the life of a saint. But it must be considered that it was no unusual thing among the Irish to set down

¹ Fordun, edit. Hearne, lib. 2, c. 12, p. 85.

² Ibid. p. 86.

stories of their remote high antiquities, or other parts of their history, in the preface to some of their saints' lives. Thus we have in the preface to the life of St. Abban,¹ and in that of St. Cadroe in Colgan's collections, rude drafts of the Irish remote antiquities.

And if Colgan had continued his collection till the 12th of May, the feast of Congal, we might perhaps in the preface to it have met with some word of a Fergus, king of Scots; for I can scarce doubt but that in Fordun's time there was extant something of this kind, in the life of that famous abbot of Banchor in Ireland, in the sixth age. But in case there was, no doubt it was to be understood of Fergus, son of Erch, for this was the Fergus who, according to the old Latin rhythmical chronicle above mentioned, brought from Ireland the famous stone, and made himself first king over the Scots, in the beginning of the sixth age, in which St. Congal Abbot lived. And so it is not unlikely that such a famous transaction, which happened near the saint's time, and which was so honourable to the Scots, both of Ireland and of Britain, might have been mentioned in the preface to this saint's life.

But it is like Fordun's mistake lay in supposing the Fergus mentioned in this life was the son of Ferchart, and in applying to him here, as he doth elsewhere, what he found said of a Fergus, first king of the Scots, that brought over the famous stone; because, for the reasons already given, he looked on Fergus, son of Ferchart, as the first founder of the Scotish monarchy, though the original writer of St. Congal's life no doubt meant Fergus, son of Erch, whom all ancient writers, till the fourteenth age, looked upon as the first king of the Scots. So that legend of St. Congal's, though we could find it, would prove of no more service towards Fordun's system, in favour of Fergus, son of Ferchart, than the Latin verses he brought for his first voucher.

I have found at last the life of this St. Congal. It was published by F. Fleming among the works of St. Columban. But there is not a word of Fergus, son of Ferchart, in it, or anything relating to Fordun's narration.

But there remained as yet the hardest and most essential part of Fordun's task, in order to support the new scheme of the Scotish kings before Fergus, son of Erch. He had to find a plausible answer to the objection drawn from the remains above mentioned of the ancient chronicles or histories of the Scots, in all which Fergus, son of Erch, is constantly reckoned first king of the Scots. Fordun was too diligent in his searches to let such pieces escape his knowledge, and he was too ingenu-

¹ Colgan. Act. SS. Hybern. tom. i. pp. 494 and 610.

ous to deny their authority, how much soever they seemed opposite to his scheme of our antiquities ; nay, he is so sincere that he mentions, and even sets down almost *verbatim*, one of the most precise of them, as we have seen elsewhere,¹ and observed the turn which he gives the passage, by the adding a few words to take off the force of it.

But that was not enough, nor like to satisfy those in whose hands those ancient pieces should fall. They are all very formal, that Fergus, son of Erch, was the first king of the Scots in Britain. The consequence seemed plainly to overturn Fordun's system of forty-five kings, or indeed of any sovereign kings at all, before this Fergus, son of Erch. Fordun was aware of this consequence, and being, I suppose, at the same time fully persuaded of the truth of what he had advanced, he finds a distinction to evade the objection to take off the force of the consequence, and to reconcile to his new system the expressions of the ancient extracts of the chronicles, where Fergus, son of Erch, is constantly called first king of the Scots.

In order to that, he found a very natural expedient to rid himself of that difficulty, and this was to suppose that there must needs have been a second beginning and new founding, or rather a restoration of the kingdom of the Scots in Britain, by Fergus, son of Erch, which gave sufficient ground to ancient authors to call this Fergus the first king of the Scots, to wit, after the restoration of the monarchy. Now a restoration necessarily supposed a dissolution ; and therefore Fordun is at much pains to find vouchers for a dissolution or destruction of the kingdom of Scots, in the times immediately preceding the fifth age, where he places the restoration of Fergus II. He quotes for that a passage of Sigebert, who had copied Tiro Prosper or Gregory of Tours. But all that the passages of these two writers import, is that Maximus, having usurped the empire, did beat off the Scots and Piets, who were making incursions upon it. But that was usual in those ages, and imports neither that the Scots had any kingdom then in Britain, nor that Maximus destroyed it; and indeed the bulk of the story that Fordun gives of Maximus, his martial feats in Britain, is originally owing to Geoffrey, who calls him Maximian, and makes him a Britain.

Upon the whole, Fordun seems to have argued or reasoned thus with himself, though he doth not express his argument in formal terms. Fergus, son of Erch, was indeed first king of the Scots in Britain, as the ancient Scotish writers call him, but that is to be understood that he was their first king after their re-entering Britain, and restoration of the monarchy ; but it

¹ *Supra*, pp. 363, 364.

doth not follow that this Fergus was absolutely their first king, or founder of the monarchy. There must needs, then, have been a dispersion of the Scots and a destruction of their monarchy in Britain in the fourth age. Fordun continues: this dispersion of the Scots, and dissolution of their monarchy, lasted about forty years; during which time all the Scots of Britain, princes and people, were dispersed and banished into foreign countries. At last, Fergus, son of Erch, descended of the ancient kings of the Scots, having gathered them together from several places, entered Britain at their head, conquered anew their ancient territories, and having set up again and restored the monarchy, became a new founder of it, and deserved to be called by the title of first king of the Scots, to wit, after this new erection or restoration of the kingdom. Thus Fordun must have reasoned, in order to reconcile his system of the forty-five kings with the remains of the ancient chronicles of the Scots.

As to the grounds or vouchers that Fordun had for this expulsion of the Scots out of Britain, all that he brings, as we observed above, is a passage of Sigebert, and the feats of Maximus from Geoffrey, who calls him Maximian. But if Fordun had lived after the times of the restoration of literature in the sixteenth or seventeenth age, when many ancient Roman writers (which in Fordun's time lay unknown in the corners of ancient libraries) were published and made common, he would have met with proofs of a defeat and expulsion of the Scots and Piets out of their possessions by the famous General Theodosius, father to the first emperor of that name, during the reign of Valentian I., and of their being forced to retire at least to the northern extremities of Britain. All this he would have found in Ammian¹ and Claudian,² two famous writers of the time; and that it happened near about the time in which he fixes the expulsion of the Scots by Maximus.

I say near about the time, for this expedition of Theodosius against the Scots and Piets happened, at soonest, A.D. 367, whereas Fordun fixes the expulsion of the Scots by Maximus precisely to the year 360; and to confirm it, he brings verses which import that the exile of the Scots out of Britain lasted forty-three years, which ending in his account by the restoration, A.D. 403, determines the year 360 for their expulsion. But as this calculation agrees not fully with the expedition of the General Theodosius, so it disagrees entirely with the usurpation of Maximus by twenty-three years, since he was not proclaimed emperor till A.D. 383. And the writers Severus Sulpitius, Zozimus, and others that lived in or near the time, ascribe no

¹ Amm. Mareel. edit. Vales. in 4to, lib. 27, p. 346, etc.

² Claudian. Panegyr. in III. & IV. Consulat. Honor.

command to Maximus in Britain, nor so much as name him till he took the purple; and are positive, that immediately after he was proclaimed emperor by the soldiers, he passed suddenly over to the Gauls, with all the forces he could make, and surprised the Emperor Gratian unawares. This leaves no room for his expedition against the Scots and Picts, either before or after his usurpation, much less for his making a long war against them.

But besides that neither these Roman writers, nor any other before the fourteenth age, give any ground to suppose that the Scots had any kingdom in Britain in the fourth age, we may surely reckon that Fordun had never seen these writers that gave an account of the expedition of Theodosius, nor perhaps ever heard of them. Accordingly in the forty-fourth, forty-fifth, and forty-ninth chapters of his second book, and first and second chapters of his third book, in which he gives an account at length of the expulsion and restoration of the Scots,—whosoever will compare his narration with the fourth chapter of the second book of Geoffrey's history of the Britains, will easily perceive whence Fordun took the story of Maximus' achievements in Britain. And nothing that we have hitherto met with in Fordun looks like a tolerable proof of a destruction or restoration of a Scottish monarchy in Britain in these times.

However, to confirm it by a new argument, Fordun gives us another Latin piece of poesy, beginning with these words, *Aymine condenso ventis*,¹ etc. Fordun doth not tell us whence he had these verses; but the lion placed in King Fergus II.'s banner at the head of his troops, and the style of the verses, can give us no better opinion of the author, and of the antiquity of this composition, than of the other verses already mentioned,² in which the entry of Fergus I. to Britain is described. So, upon the whole, it appears that the chief ground Fordun had to go upon for a dissolution and restoration of the Scottish monarchy in the fourth age, were not drawn from the authority of ancient writers, but that his chief motive was to reconcile,

¹ • Agmine condenso ventis velamina pandit :

Et ratis æquoreos atque galea petunt

Fluctus : in his acies juvenum phalerata superbo

Principe congreditur. Nec mora, turba potens

Ad natale solum properat ; relevare jacentes

Rex fasces regni cespite sospes adit

Intrepidus patrio, pandens vexilla Leonis,

Terruit occursu quem fera nulla ferox.

Ocius advenit, fuerat quæ turbine diro

Subdita plebs, annis X quater et tribus ; hæc

Congaudens patrio regi servire parata,

Ad libertatem quicquid ut orbe volat.'

—*Fordun*, lib. 3, c. 1, p. 171, edit. Th. Hearne.

² *Supra*, p. 398.

by that means, the formal expressions of the extracts or abridgments of the old Scottish chronicles, such as we have set them down, with the persuasion that he was in that the Scottish monarchy was begun many ages before Fergus, son of Erch.

As to his placing the beginning of Fergus, son of Erch's reign in the year 403, instead of 503, and thus anticipating the date of it a full hundred years, as we have shown,¹ I see no other reason for this, than that, looking on the beginning of this Fergus' reign rather as the restoration of an ancient kingdom, dissolved by oppression and invasion, than as the setting up a new one, and finding in such histories as he had occasion to meet with no more proper person to become the author of the Scottish overthrow than the tyrant Maximus, as he is described by Geoffrey, towards the end of the fourth century, he found it necessary to place the restoration about the beginning of the fifth century, lest if he had deferred it, and by consequence the beginning of Fergus II.'s reign, till the sixth century, the interval of about one hundred and forty years would have been too long, and the monarchy restored by Fergus II. would rather have looked like the setting up of a new kingdom than the continuation or restoration of an ancient one.

But it happened here to Fordun, what usually falls out to those that build upon a crazy foundation, the building they erect must necessarily be tottering, and full of crevices, so that no sooner one chink or crevice is filled up, but another breaks out. This anticipating the reign of Fergus II. about one hundred years (besides that it is contradicted by all the remains of our ancient history, and by the common way of allowing three generations to a century) threw Fordun's system into another inconvenience, and discovered a new flaw in it, by making three generations fill up two centuries, against the constant course of descents and succession of the race of our kings ever since, as I have shown elsewhere.²

As to the number of the ancient kings preceding Fergus II., there was nothing certain till Fordun. We have seen³ the uncertainties and contradictions under which our countrymen laboured when the story of these ancient kings was first advanced. The first account we have of their number from an unknown hand⁴ in these dark times is absolutely incredible; and I have seen a Scottish writer,⁵ in the time of King James III. or IV., that reckons the number of these kings six score, beginning at Simon Breac, who, this writer supposes, came in person to Scotland. The Scots nobility's letter to Pope John XXII.,

¹ *Supra*, p. 372, etc.

² *Ibid.* pp. 372, 373.

³ *Ibid.* p. 383.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Biblioth. Reg. Lond. ad caleem Chron. And. Winton:

A.D. 1320, reduces them from that exorbitant number, and fixes the number of these ancient kings to that of fifty-seven. Fordun lays aside about a dozen more, and reduces them to forty-five. Boece and his followers take off five or six more, and fix the number of the kings before Fergus II. at thirty-nine; by all which we see the Scots, in former ages, were not so scrupulous as some of our modern writers, who make it a crime to alter the number of those ancient kings, as they are set down by Boece. But to return to Fordun, he gives us no account of the grounds he went upon for this number of forty-five, nor so much as the names of these kings, except three or four, or such as may be supposed to be in the old genealogy, without distinguishing who of those were kings, or who were not.

As to their lives and actions, we are left almost quite in the dark by Fordun. He gives us a touch of the beginning of his Fergus I.'s reign, applying to him, as the first king, what belonged to Fergus, son of Erch, who was truly the first king; and after adding something of Rether, whom he supposes all one with Bede's Reuda, all the rest of his second book designed to contain the history of his forty-five kings, is filled up, most part, with parcels of the general history, sacred or profane, of these first ages, and particularly of the Romans, Britains, Scots, and Picts, taken from Eutropius, Bede, Jeffery of Monmouth, etc., from some legends and traditions of the vulgar, and without so much as naming any one more of these forty-five kings. Fordun concludes their whole history in these few words¹ :—‘A primo hujus Regni Rege Fergusio filio Ferehard ad [hunc] Regem Fergusium filium Erch inclusive quadraginta quinque Reges ejusdem gentis et generis, in hac insula regnaverunt. Sed et horum, singillatim distinguere tempora Principatum, ad praesens omittimus, nam ad plenum scripta non reperimus.’ This is, indeed, but a sorry account of these his ancient kings; however, in these last words, Fordun insinuates that he had found some account of them, but not full enough to be set down.

The truth is, Fordun had the old genealogy, containing the series of the descents from Fergus, son of Ferchard, called Fergus I., till Fergus II., the son of Erch. This was indeed some account, being about thirty-two names; but though they had been all kings of Scots in Britain, which was to be proved, yet there were still wanting twelve or thirteen more to make up the number of forty-four or forty-five. So he had reason to say that he had not as yet found a full account of them.

If Fordun had left any other account of the forty-five kings than this, it would, no doubt, have been preserved with a yet greater care than the collections, it is believed, he left towards

¹ *Ford. lib. 3, c. 2, edit. Hearne, p. 173.*

continuing down his chronicle after the first five books. These collections have been preserved, and perhaps may be a part of what M. Hearne hath printed, beginning p. 499 of his edition of Fordun, A.D. 1722. Now any collections left by Fordun of the forty-five kings had been much more precious than those of modern times, and had been, no doubt, preserved by those who had the care and keeping of his chronicles and his other collections, or by some or other of his many continuators in the fifteenth age, who were all in quest of materials for supplying the deficiency or gap in the story of the forty-five kings left imperfect in his second book.

The words of Fordun, ‘A primo hujus Regni Rege,’ etc., above cited, craved that of them, and made a natural impression of the want of a supplement upon those that read or copied that passage; as we see by an addition to Fordun’s text in the ms. chronicle of Couper,¹ where, after these last words of the above-cited passage, ‘ad plenum scripta non reperimus,’ the writer adds, ‘praeterquam,’ lib. 3, c. 9, by which it would at first appear that the writer sends us to a place where we will find, at least, some further account of the forty-five kings preceding Fergus, son of Erch; but when we come to this place, all we meet with is a part of the old Latin chronicle in rhythm, beginning, ‘Primus in Ergadia Fergus rexit tribus annis,’ and so continues down the rest of the series of the king’s successors to Fergus II., son of Erch, instead of those of Fergus I., which the reader was put in hopes of. But this shows the lively impression that passage of Fordun made on that writer of the want of a supplement to the forty-five kings. Most of the other continuators of Fordun have made additions to his text; but none of them give us any further account of the forty-five ancient kings of Scots before Fergus, son of Erch.

The first I have met with that attempted it is one Gremond Domate, whose ms. history is in the library of St. Genoveve at Paris. Of this author, and of his essay on the kings before Fergus, son of Erch, I have elsewhere² given a full account, to which I refer the reader. I have only here to add, 1st, That this writer, for a further account of the forty-five kings, sends us to the old books of Ireland; for in his translation of Fordun, he gives this version, or rather paraphrase, in his old Gaulois, of Fordun’s famous passage, ‘A primo hujus Regni Rege,’ etc.³:—‘A present laissons de parler [de ces 45 Rois] qui tous furent d’ung mesme sang et genre comme plainement appert aux anciens Livres d’Hybernie (*sic*) car a present n’avons trouvé a plain de leur antique origine dignifique (*sic*).’ 2d, That Domate wrote

¹ Chron. Cupri ms., lib. 3, c. 2.

² *Supra*, p. 343

³ Grem. Domate ms., lib. 3, c. 2, fol. 50.

and dedicated his translation of this chronicle of Scotland to John, Duke of Albany, A.D. 1519, that is, about five or six years only before Boece's history appeared in print, and about the very time that Boece's famous vouchers were said to have been discovered, with an ample account, as Boece tells us, of the first forty kings.

CONCLUSION.

SEC. VI.—*Sixth and last step of the growth of our High Antiquities by Boece and Buchanan.*

It only remains to treat now, 1st, Of Boece's own labours, and of his bringing the fabric of our high antiquities to its full height and dimensions, by giving us, on the credit of his vouchers, besides other embellishments, a detailed account of the lives and actions of the forty kings before Fergus, son of Erch, which Fordun and his continuators had left so lame and imperfect. 2d. Of the polishing anda dorning this fabric by Buchanan, a more polite writer and more skilled architect, who, removing the rubbish of palpable fables, and reforming the irregularities that Boece's unskilful hand had left in that fabric, reduced it to a more perfect symmetry, and varnished it all over, to render it more taking and agreeable to his countrymen, and more proper to support the cause in which he was embarked.

But having given elsewhere a full account of the labours of both these writers of our history in its proper place,¹ I need only refer the reader to it.

But to do justice to Hector Boece, I cannot but add here to what I have elsewhere² observed, that as to the motives he had in writing our history, I cannot see the least ground to suspect that he himself had any view or design to support any party or faction against the sovereign, or to justify the rebellion against King James III., but quite the contrary, in the catalogue which Boece left of our kings, in which he gives a short character of each of them, and continues it down till King James v. He gives a quite contrary character of King James III. from what Buchanan gives him, and from what he himself had given of the wicked kings from his Veremund; and speaks with indignation of the conspiracy of a part of the nobility against him, and of the manner of his death that ensued upon it. And no wonder, for he had his information from the great and loyal

¹ *Supra*, p. 130, etc., and pp. 176, 205, etc.

² *Supra*, p. 207.

Bishop Elphinston, who remained stedfast in his fidelity to his sovereign King James III. to the last moment. All this is a new confirmation that Boece's simplicity was imposed upon by the pretended histories of Veremund, etc., which he took for genuine copies of ancient pieces, though, as it hath been shown elsewhere, they were forged after the Act passed to justify the rebellion against King James III., and most probably by some of those concerned in that rebellion, or by dependers on those who had a hand in it. But enough of that in its proper place.

As to Buchanan, his motives in writing our history are demonstrated by his own actions and writings, of which enough also hath been said.

And now, after all that I have said in this chapter, and the account that I have given of the several steps and additions by which our high antiquities grew up through the several ages and hands they have passed, the learned and judicious reader will be now pretty well satisfied that at the bottom all the stories of these remote antiquities, that is, of the forty kings of the Scots in Britain before Fergus, son of Erch, are, if not absolutely fabulous, at least entirely uncertain and groundless, notwithstanding all the details of facts, successions of kings, attended with genealogies and chronological dates, and all the other characters (except that of sufficient vouchers) of ancient authentic histories in which they are dressed up, and of the air of assurance with which they are presented by Boece and Buchanan.

But, at the same time, I hope that the learned among my countrymen will easily observe that the freedom that I have taken to lay open the uncertainty of those remote antiquities, as they are delivered by our modern writers, doth in no manner derogate from the real honour of our country; for, besides that there can be no real honour but what is grounded upon truth, what hath been said in the first book of this essay, particularly of the descent of the present inhabitants of Scotland from the most ancient or first known inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain, to wit, partly from the Mæats or Midland Britains, partly from the Caledonians or Picts, as well as from the Scots, and of the antiquity of the monarchy of Albany, and number of kings in the Pictish line, doth abundantly compensate the loss of the first forty kings; as the honour of the pretended martial achievements, attributed by Fordun, Boece, etc. to the Scots, under the reigns of Julius Cæsar, Augustus, and the following first Roman emperors, without any authority, is fully counterbalanced by the noble opposition that the Romans met with from the Caledonians, and their maintaining their ancient possessions to the north of the friths, and their liberty, during so

many ages, against all the Roman forces in Britain, whilst all the other inhabitants were brought under the Roman yoke; and all this supported by the testimony of the best contemporary Roman writers.

To conclude now this essay. I hope the reader will have met with in it as distinct an account as the few remains we have of these first times do furnish us of the several ancient inhabitants of the northern parts of Britain (so well known these many ages by the name of Scotland), to wit, of the Romans, Britains, Caledonians or Picts, Scots, etc. I have endeavoured to trace each of these people down, from the first appearance they make in these parts of Britain, till they disappeared under their proper names, either by retiring elsewhere, or by being, by degrees, incorporated into one body of people, and under one government, with the Scots, become to be the ruling people; they came all, at last, to be known by the common name of Scots.

The view I have given of the situation of these several ancient inhabitants, especially in the earliest times of Christianity in those northern parts, will appear with more advantage in the second or chronological part of this essay, if I live to continue it, and will help to discover to the reader the occasions of the first entry of the light of the gospel, and of the progress that the doctrine and discipline of the Christian church made among these northern nations; all these dispensations of the mercies of God having often, in the common course, a certain connection with the civil state and circumstances of a people on whom it pleases God to bestow them, according to His infinitely wise providence.

APPENDIX OF ANCIENT PIECES.¹

HAVING already given an account of the several pieces contained in this Appendix, and there being before each of them a reference to the page of this essay where they are described, it would be unnecessary to say anything further here.

But the names of the first forty-two kings of the Scots, from Fergus till Malcolm Keanmore, which frequently occur in these pieces, being all of them originally Gaelic or Irish, from thence it hath happened that, most of our writers being Lowlanders, ignorant of that ancient language, there hath ensued so great a variety in the pronouncing, spelling, and writing those old names in the different writers, ms. or printed, and our modern historians have at length so altered some of them that they appear quite different names, and no more like to those which we meet with in the ancient chronicles or catalogues of our kings; so that without some knowledge of the more ancient forms of writing these names, it is not possible to understand some important passages concerning Scotish matters that occur in ancient pieces.

Who could, for example, by consulting only the names of our kings, such as our modern writers represent them, understand by which of our kings these ancient laws and statutes were at first made, which, according to the second piece in the Appendix, are said to have been renewed by King Donald Mac-Alpin, in an assembly of the Scots at Forteviot? *In hujus [Domnalli R.] tempore jura ac leges Edi filii Edach fecerunt Goedeli [i.e. Scotti] cum rege suo in Fothuir-tubaicht?* For in the modern catalogues of our kings, such as those of Fordun, Boece, and Buchanan, we find no such names; whereas in ancient chronicles or catalogues we meet with Eda or Edus, whose surname was Fion, *i.e.* White, the eighteenth king of the Scots, called by the moderns, in one word, Etfinus, who was son to Eochoid Rinneval, called otherwise Echdach or Echadach, the thirteenth king, whom our moderns miscall Eugenius Quintus. So of these ancient laws, made about the beginning of the eighth age, we should know nothing by consulting our modern writers, though they must have been very famous in ancient times, since they are taken notice of by this Irish writer (for such I take him to have been, till I can meet with further light concerning him).

¹ By permission of W. F. Skene, Esq., the ancient pieces in this appendix have been printed from the corrected and enlarged texts contained in *The Chronicle of the Picts, Chronicles of the Scots*, and other early memorials of Scottish History, edited by that gentleman.

For these and such like reasons, especially to help to understand any other ancient pieces of our history that may yet be discovered, at home or abroad, I conceived it would be a useful curiosity to give here, by way of introduction to this Appendix of Ancient Pieces, a catalogue of these first forty-two kings, according to the order of their succession, as I find it uniformly set down in all the more ancient chronicles or catalogues of them taken from our genuine annals, together with all the various forms in which I have observed these names written in ancient or modern authors; and, in the first place, those names as they are originally written in Gaelic, upon which all the rest, by different pronunciations, corrupt reading, ignorance of the language, etc., have been formed or derived from them. In the last place, I shall set down the names given to these kings by our modern historians.

Meantime the reader may find, p. 87 *supra*, where I have treated of the names of the Pictish kings, some remarks upon the occasion of these alterations in ancient names to which I refer. I shall only here observe that the letter c in Gaelic or Irish is always pronounced κ, and the letters BH and MH are pronounced v, and gh, w; that in the notes on the pieces of the Appendix these abbreviations—r, signifies *forte* or *forsitan*, and l, *lege*.

Catalogue or Series of the names of the first Forty-two Kings of the Scots, according to the true order of their succession, with the various forms of their names as they are found in ancient and modern writers.

The letters ^a^b^c, etc., placed over the various names in the following catalogue of the first forty-two kings of the Scots, mark the chronicles or writers whence they are taken, according to this Index.

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a Appendix, No. 3. | f Winton's Chronicle. |
| b Appendix, No. 4. | g Fordun's Chronicle. |
| c Genealogia in Append. No. 4. | h The two Genealogies in Fordun. |
| d Append. No. 5. | i Boece. |
| e Append. No. 6. | k Buchanan. |

1. Feargus fil. Erc, Erch,^a Eric,^b Erth.^f
2. Domangard, Domhangard,^b Dovenghart,^a Donegart,^e Dongard,^g or Dongardus.^k
3. Comgall, Congal, Congel,^b Congallus.^k
4. Gabran,^c Gabhran, Gauran,^a Gouren,^e Goveran,^b Gonranus,^k Conranus.ⁱ
5. Conall, Convallns.^s
6. Aodan, Aidan, Edan,^b Edain,^b Edhan,^a Aidanus.^s
7. Eochoid-bnidhe, Eochod-flavus,^b Heoghed-bude,^a Eoghed-bod,^e Heeged-bud,^f Echac-buidhe, Ochabind,^b Engeinus iv.^{g h}
8. Connadh-cearr, Kinat-kerr,^c Kinat-sinister,^b Keneth-ker.ⁱ
9. Fearchair,^a Fercar,^b Ferquarth,^c Ferquardus.^k
10. Domnall-breac, Domhnal-breac, Dovenald-varius,^b Downald-brec,^t Donaldus iv.
11. Malduin, Maldowny,^f Maldninus.ⁱ
12. Fearcair-fada, Fergar-longus,^b Ferchar-foda,^a Ferquardus.^k

13. Eochoidh rinnemhail, Eochol-habens-curvum-nasum,^b Heoghed^d
Rinavel-Echdac-Echadach,^{a,h} Eoghed,^e Hecged-ronaval,^f Eu-
genius v.^{g,k}
 14. Ainbceallach, Armchallach,^e Arinchellac,^b Armkellech,^d Amrikel-
lēth,^g Ambirkeletus.^k
 15. Eogan,^e Eoghan, Ewan, Ewen,^b Heatgan,^d Eugenius vi.^{g,k}
 16. Muireadach, Murdauch,^e Murechat,^b Murdochus, Murthee,^f Mur-
dahu, Mordacus,ⁱ Murdacus.^{g,k}
 17. Eogan,^e Heoghan,^d Ewan,^f Ewen,^b Eugenius vii.
 18. Aodh-fionn, Ed-albus,^b Heth-fin,^d Hedwhite,^f Eda^a-find^c-Ethafind,^h
Etfinus.^k
 19. Feargus, Fergus.
 20. Sealbhach, Selvach, Selvac,^b Sealuanc,^e Sealuhane,^a Sewald,^f
Selwathius,^g Solwathius.^k
 21. Eochoih-anguibh, Eochal-annuine, Eochal-venenosus,^b Heoghed-
annuine,^d Eogad-annuin,^e Echach, Ethacus,^h Eokal,^f Achajus.
 22. Dunghal, Dunegal,^b Doughal,^f Dungallus.^k
 23. Ailpin, Alpin.
 24. Cionaodh, Cinacha,^c Kinadius,^a Kenaucht, Kinedus,^b Kinath,^d
Kenethus.^g
 25. Domhal, Dunevaldus,^a Domnail,^c Dolfnal,^b Dovenald.^d
 26. Constaingtin.
 27. Aodh, Ed,^d Edus,^a Het,^b Eth, Ethus.^k
 28. Gairig, Girg,^d Giric,^a Greg,^b Gregorius.^d
 29. Domhnal, Dovenald, Doneval,^b Donevaldus,^a Donaldus.^k
 30. Constaingtin.
 31. Maelcoluim, Maelcolai,^c Malcolm,^b Milcolumbus.^k
 32. Iondolbh, Indolf,^b Induff,^d Indulfus.^k
 33. Dubhoda, Duf,^b Niger,^a Duffus.^k
 34. Cuilin, Culin,^b Culenrig,^a Culenus.^k
 35. Cionadh, Ciadius,^a Cinada,^c Kinadius, Kinet,^b Kenethus.^k
 36. Constaingtin.
 37. Grim-Maedubh, Chinet,^b Girgh^d-mac-Kinath, Greg, Grimus.^g
 38. Malcolium Milcolumbus.
 39. Donnchadh, Donchath,^d Dunecan, Donuchada,^c Duncanus.ⁱ
 40. Macbeatha, Machetad, Macbethad, Macbeth,^b Machabaeus.ⁱ
 41. Lulach,^b Lahoulan,^e Luthlath.ⁱ
 42. Malcoluim, Malcolmⁱ-cean-more, Malcolm,^b Kenremore,^c Milcol-
umbus.^h
-

I.—DE SITU ALBANIE, QUE IN SE FIGURAM HOMINIS HABET,
QUOMODO FUIT PRIMITUS IN SEPTEM REGIONIBUS DIVISA,
QUIBUSQUE NOMINIBUS ANTIQUITUS SIT VOCATA, ET A QUIBUS
INHABITATA. *Vide supra*, p. 327.

(MS. Colb. Bib. Imp. Paris, 4126.)

OPERE pretium puto mandare memorie qualiter Albania, et a quibus
habitatoribus primitus habitata, quibus nominibus nuncupata, et in
quot partibus partita.

Legimus in historiis et in cronicis antiquorum Britonum, et in gestis et annalibus antiquis Scottorum et Pictorum, quod illa regio, que nunc corrupte vocatur Scotia, antiquitus appellabatur Albania ab Albanecto juniori filio Brutus primi regis Britannorum majoris Britannie. Et post multum intervallum temporis a Pictis, Pictavia: qui regnaverunt in ea per circulum **MLXX.** annorum. Secundum quosdam **MCCCLX.** Nunc vero corrupte vocatur Scocia. Scotti vero regnaverunt per spacium **CCCXV.** annorum anno illo quo Willelmus rex rufus, frater Malcolmii viri honeste vite et virtutis, regnum suscepit.

Regio enim ista formam et figuram hominis in se habet. Pars namque principalis ejus, id est, caput, est in Arregarchel in occidentali parte Scocie supra mare Hybernie. Pedes vero ejus sunt supra mare Northwagie. Montes vero et deserta de Arregarchel capiti et collo hominis assimilantur. Corpus vero ipsius est mons qui Mound vocatur, qui a mari occidentali usque ad mare orientale extenditur. Brachia autem ejus sunt ipsi montes qui dividunt Scociam ab Arre-gachel. Latus dextere partis ex Muref, et Ros, et Marr, et Buchen. Crura enim illius sunt illa duo principalia et preclara flumina, que descendunt de monte predicto, id est, Mound, que vocantur Tae et Spe: quorum unum fluit citra montem, alterum vero ultra in mare Norwegale. Inter crura hujus hominis sunt Eneagus et Moerne citra montem, et ultra montem alie terre inter Spe et montem.

Hec vero terra a septem fratribus divisa fuit antiquitus in septem partes: quarum pars principalis est Eneagus cum Moerne ab Eneagus primogenito fratrum sic nominata. Secunda autem pars est Adtheodele et Gouerin. Pars etiam tertia est Sradeern cum Meneted. Quarta pars partium est Fif cum Fothreue. Quinta vero pars est Marr cum Buchen. Sexta autem est Muref es Ros. Septima enim pars est Cathanesia citra montem et ultra montem, quia mons Mound dividit Cathanesiam per medium. Quilibet ergo istarum partium regio tunc vocabatur et erat, quia unaqueque earum subregionem in se habebat. Inde est ut hii septem fratres predicti pro septem regibus habebantur, septem regulos sub se habentes. Isti septem fratres regnum Albaniæ in septem regna divisorunt, et unusquisque in tempore suo in suo regno regnavit.

Primum regnum fuit, sicut mihi verus relator retulit, Andreas, videlicet, vir venerabilis Katanensis episcopus, nacione Scottus et Dunfermelis monachus, ab illa aqua optima, que Scottice vocata est Froch, Brittanice Werid, Romane vero Scottewattre, id est, Aqua Scottorum; que regna Scottorum et Anglorum dividit et currit juxta oppidum de Strivelin, usque ad flumen aliud nobile, quod vocatum est Tae. Secundum regnum ad Hilef, sicut mare circuit, usque ad montem aquilonali plaga de Strivelin qui vocatur Athran. Tertium regnum ab Hilef usque ad De. Quartum regnum ex De usque ad magnum et mirabile flumen quod vocatur Spe, majorem et meliorem tocius Scocie. Quintum regnum de Spe usque ad montem Bruin-alban. Sextum regnum fuit Muref et Ros. Septimum regnum erat Arregaithil.

Arregathel dicitur quasi Margo Scottorum seu Hibernensium, quia

omnes Hibernenses et Scotti generaliter Gatheli dicuntur a quodam eorum primevo duce Gaethelglas vocato. Ibi enim semper Hibernenses applicare solebant ad dampna facienda Britannis. Vel idecirco quia Scotti Picti ibi habitabant primitus post redditum suum de Hibernia; vel quia Hibernenses illas partes occupavere super Pictos; vel, quod certius est, quia illa pars regionis Scottie affinitima est regioni Hibernie.

Fergus filius Eric ipse fuit primus qui de semine Chonare suscepit regnum Alban, id est, a monte Brunalban usque ad mare Hibernic et ad Inchegall. Deinde reges de semine Fergus regnaverunt in Brunalban, siue Brunhere, usque ad Alpinum filium Eochal. Kined filius hujus Alpini primus Scottorum annis xvi. in Pictinia feliciter regnavit.

H.—CRONICA DE ORIGINE ANTIQUORUM PICTORUM. *Vide supra.*
p. 74.

(MS. Colb. Bib. Imp. Paris, 4126.)

PICTI propria lingua nomen habent a picto corpore; eo quod, aculeis ferreis cum atramento, variarum figurarum stingmate annotantur. Scotti qui nunc corrupte vocantur Hibernenses quasi Sciti, quia a Scithia regione venerunt, et inde originem duxerunt; sine a Scotta filia Pharaonis regis Egypti, que fuit ut fertur regina Scottorum. Sciendum vero est quod Britones in tertia mundi etate ad Britanniam venerunt. Scite autem, id est, Scotti, in quarta etate Scociam, siue Hiberniam obtinuerunt. Gentes Scicie albo crine nascuntur ab assiduis nivibus; et ipsius capilli color genti nomen dedit, et inde dicuntur Albani: de quibus originem duxerunt Scotti et Picti. Horum glauca oculis, id est, picta in est pupilla, adeo ut nocte plusquam die cernant. Albani autem vicini Amazonibus fuerunt. Gothi a Magog filio Japheth nominati putantur, de similitudine ultime sillabe; quos veteres Greci magis Gethas, quam Gothos, vocaverunt. Gens fortis et potentissima, corporum mole ardua, armorum genere terribilis. De quibus Lucanus:

‘Hinc Dacus premat, inde Gethi incurvant Hiberis.’

Daci autem Gottorum soboles fuerunt: et dictos putant Dacos quasi Dagos, quia de Gottorum stirpe creati sunt: de quibus ille,

‘Ibis arcos procul usque Dacos.’

Scithe et Gothi a Magog originem traxerunt. Scithia, quoque et Gothia, ab eodem Magog filio Japhet fertur cognominata: cuius terra olim ingens fuit; nam ab oriente Indie, a septentrione, per paludes Meotidas, inter Danubium et oceanum, usque ad Germanie fines porrigebatur. Postea minor effecta est a dextra orientis parte qui oceanus Siricus conditur, usque ad mare Caspium, quod est ad occasum. De hinc a meridie usque ad Caucasi jugum deducta est; cui subjacet Hircania ab occasu: habens pariter gentes multas, propter terrarum infecunditatem, late vagantes, ex quibus quedam

agros incolunt; quedam portentuose ac truces, carnibus humanis, et eorum sanguine, vivunt. Scithie plures terre sunt locupletes, inhabitabiles tum plures. Namque in plerisque locis auro et gemmis affluent; giphorum immanitate accessus hominum rarus est. Smaragdis autem optimus hec patria est. Cianeus quoque lapis, et cristallus purissimus Scithie est. Habent et flumina magna, Oscorim, Fasidem, et Araxen. Prima Europe regio Scithia inferiorum, que e Meotidis paludibus incipiens inter Danubium et oceanum septentrionalem, usque ad Germaniam porrigitur: que terra generaliter propter barbaras gentes quibus inhabitata barbarica dicitur. Hujus pars prima Alania est, que ad Meotidas paludes pertingit. Post hanc Dacia, ubi et Gothia. Deinde Germania, ubi plurimam partem Suevi incoluerunt. In partes Asiaticae Scithie sunt gentes que posteros se Jasonis credunt: albo crine nascuntur ab assiduis nivibus. De his ista sufficiunt.

Cruidne filius Cinge, pater Pictorum habitantium in hae insula, c. annis regnavit. Vii. filios habuit. Hee sunt nomina eorum: Fib, Fidach, Floclaid, Fortrenn, Got, Ce, Circinn.

Circin ix. regnavit.

Fidaich xl.

Fortrenn lxx.

Floclaid xxx.

Got xij.

Ce xv.

Fibaid xxiiij.

Gede olgudach lxxx.

Denbecan c.

Olfincta lx.

Guidid gaed brechach l.

Gest gurcich xl.

Wurgest xxx.

Brude bont, a quo xxx. Brude regnaverunt Hiberniam et Albaniam per centum l. annorum spacium, xlviij. annis regnavit. Id est

Brude pant.

Brude urpant.

Brude leo.

Brude uleo.

Brude gant.

Brude urgant.

Brude gnith.

Brude urguith.

Brude fecir.

Brude urfecir.

Brude cal.

Brude ureal.

Brude cint.

Brude urcint.

Brude fet.

Brude urfet.

- Brude rn.
 Brude eru.
 Brude gart et urgart.
 Brude cinid.
 Brude nrenid.
 Brude uip.
 Brude uruiip.
 Brude grid.
 Brude urgrid.
 Brude mund.
 Brude urmund.
 Gilgidi c. l. annis regnavit.
 Tharain c.
 Morleo xv.
 Deocilunon xl.
 Cimoiod filius Arcois vij.
 Deoord l.
 Bliesblitnþ v.
 Dectotric frater Diu xl.
 Usconbutz xxx.
 Carvorst xl.
 Deo ardivois xx.
 Vist l.
 Ru c.
 Gartnaith loc, a quo Garnart iiiij. regnavere. ix. annis regnavit.
 Breth filius Buthut vij.
 Vipoig namet xxx. annis regnavit.
 Canutulachama iiiij. annis regnavit.
 Wradech uecla ii. annis regnavit.
 Gartnaich diuberr lx. annis regnavit.
 Talore filius Achivir lxxv. annis regnavit.
 Drust filius Erp c. annis regnavit et c. bella peregit; ix. decimo
 anno regi ejus Patricius episcopus sanctus ad Hiberniam pervenit
 insulam.
 Talore filius Aniel iiiij. annis regnavit.
 Necton morbet filius Erip xxiiij. regnavit. Tertio anno regni ejus
 Darlugdach abbatissa Cilledara de Hibernia exulat pro Christo ad
 Britanniam. Secundo anno adventus sui immolavit Nectonius Abur-
 nthigie Deo et Sancte Brigide presente Dairlugdach que cantavit
 alleluia super istam hostiam.
 Optulit igitur Nectonius magnus filius Wirp, rex omnium pro-
 vinciarum Pictorum, Apurnethige Sancte Brigide, usque ad diem
 judicii, cum suis finibus, que posite sunt a lapide in Apurfeirt usque
 ad lapidem juxta Ceirfuill, id est, Lethfoss, et inde in altum usque
 ad Athan. Causa autem oblationis hec est. Nectonius in vita julie
 manens fratre suo Drusto expulsante se usque ad Hiberniam Brigidam
 sanctam petivit ut postulasset Deum pro se. Orans autem pro illo
 dixit: Si pervenies ad patriam tuam Dominus miserebitur tui: regnum
 Pictorum in pace possidlebis.
 Drest Gurthimnoch xxx. annis regnavit.

Galanan erilich xij. annis regnavit.
 Da drest, id est, Drest filius Gyrom, id est, Drest filius Wdrost v.
 annis conregnaverunt. Drest filius Girom solus v. annis regnavit.
 Garthnach filius Girom vij. annis regnavit.
 Cailtram filius Girom uno anno regnavit.
 Talorg filius Muircholaich xi. annis regnavit.
 Drest filius Munait uno anno regnavit.
 Galam cennaleph uno anno regnavit.
 Cum Briduo i. anno.
 Bridei filius Maileon xxx. annis regnavit. In octavo anno regni
 ejus baptizatus est sancto a Columba.
 Gartnart filius Domelch xi. annis regnavit.
 Nectu nepos Uerd xx. annis regnavit.
 Cinioch filius Lutrin xix. annis regnavit.
 Garnard filius Wid iiij. annis regnavit.
 Bredei filius Wid v. annis regnavit.
 Talore frater eorum xii. annis regnavit.
 Tallorcen filius Enfret iiij. annis regnavit.
 Gartnait filius Donnel vij. annis regnavit et dimidium.
 Drest frater ejus vij. annis regnavit.
 Bredei filius Bili xxi. annis regnavit.
 Taran filius Entifidich iiij. annis regnavit.
 Bredlei filius Derelei xi. annis regnavit.
 Necthon filius Derelei xv. annis regnavit.
 Drest et Elpiu congregaverunt v. annis.
 Onnist filius Urguist xxx. regnavit.
 Bredei filius Wirguist ij. annis regnavit.
 Cinid filius Wredech xij. annis regnavit.
 Elpin filius Wroid iiij. annis regnavit et dimidium.
 Drest filius Talorgen iiij. vel v. annis regnavit.
 Talorgen filius Onnist ij. annis et dimidium regnavit.
 Canaul filius Tarl'a v. annis regnavit.
 Castantin filius Wrguist xxxv. annis regnavit.
 Unuist filius Wrguist xij. annis regnavit.
 Drest filius Constantini, et Talorgen filius Wthoil iiij. annis con-
 regnaverunt.
 Uven filius Vnuist iij. annis regnavit.
 Wrad filius Bargoit iii. et,
 Bred uno anno regnaverunt.

III.—EXCERPTA EX VETERI CHRONICO DE REGIBUS SCOTTORUM A
KENETIUO MAC-ALPIN AD MAC-MALCOLM. *Vide supra*, p. 328.

(MS. Colb. Bib. Imp. Paris, 4126.)

KINADIUS igitur filius Alpini, primus Scottorum, rexit feliciter istam
 annis xvi. Pietaviam. Pietavia autem a Pictis est nominata; quos,
 ut diximus, Cinadius delevit. Deus enim eos pro merito sue malitie

alienos ac octiosos hereditate dignatus est facere: quia illi non solum Domini missam ac preceptum spreverunt; sed et in jure equitatis aliis equi parari noluerunt. Iste vero, biennio antequam veniret Pictaviam, Dalriete regnum suscepit. Septimo anno regni sui, reliquias Sancti Columbe transportavit ad ecclesiam quam construxit, et invasit sexies Saxoniam; et concremavit Dunbarre atque Marlos usurpata. Britanni autem concremaverunt Dubblain, atque Danari vastaverunt Pictaviam, ad Cluanan et Duncalden. Mortuus est tandem tumore ani, idus Februarii feria tertia in palacio Fothuirtabaicht.

Dunevaldus, frater ejus, tenuit idem regnum iiiij. annis. In hujus tempore, jura ac leges regni Edi filii Eedach fecerunt Goedeli cum rege suo in Fothiurhabaith. Obiit in palacio Cin Belachoir idus Aprilis.

Constantinus filius Cinadi regnavit annis xvi. Primo ejus anno Maelsechnaill rex Hibernensium obiit; et Aed filius Niel tenuit regnum; ac post duos annos vastavit Amlaib, cum gentibus suis, Pictaviam, et habitauit eam, a kalendis Januarii usque ad festum Sancti Patricii. Tertio iterum anno Amlaib, trahens centum, a Constantino occisus est. Paulo post ab eo bello in xiiiij. ejus facto in Dolair inter Danarios et Scottos, occisi sunt Scotti co Achcochlam. Normanni annum integrum degerunt in Pictavia.

Edus tenuit idem i. anno. Ejus etiam brevitas nil historie memorabile commendavit; sed in civitate Nrum est occisus.

Eochodius autem filius Run regis Britannorum, nepos Cinadei ex filia, regnavit annis xi. Licit Ciricium filium alii dicunt hic regnasse; eo quod alumpnus ordinatore Eochodio fiebat. Cujus secundo anno Aed filius Neil moritur; ac in ix. ejus anno, in ipso die Cirici, eclipsis solis facta est. Eochodius, cum alumpno suo, expulsus est nunc de regno.

Donivaldus filius Constantini tenuit regnum xi. annos. Normanni tunc vastaverunt Pictaviam. In hujus regno bellum est factum Innisibsonian, inter Danarios et Scottos: Scotti habuerunt victoriam. Opidum Fother occisum est a gentibus.

Constantinus filius Edii tenuit regnum xl. annos. Cujus tertio anno Normanni predaverunt Duncalden, omnemque Albaniam. In sequenti utique anno occisi sunt in Sraithherne Normanni, ac in vi. anno Constantinus rex, et Cellachus episcopus, leges disciplinasque fidei, atque jura ecclesiarum evangeliorumque, pariter cum Scottis in colle credulitatis, prope regali civitati Scoan devoverunt custodiri. Ab hoc die collis hoc meruit nomen, id est, collis credulitatis. Et in suo octavo anno cecidit excelsissimus rex Hibernensium et archiepiscopus, apud Laignechos, id est, Cormace filius Culennan. Et mortui sunt in tempore hujus, Donevaldus rex Britannorum, et Duuenaldus filius Ede rex eligitur; et Flann filius Maelsechnaill, et Niall filius Ede, qui regnavit tribus annis post Flann, etc. Bellum Tinemore factum est in xviii. anno inter Constantimum et Regnall, et Scotti habuerunt victoriam. Et bellum Duinbrunde in xxxiiij. ejus anno ubi cecidit filius Indrechtaig, mormair Oengusa. Adalstan filius Advar rig Saxon, et Eochaid filius Alpini, mortui sunt. Et in senectute decrepitus baculum cepit, et Domino servivit: et regnum mandavit Mael filio Domnail.

Maelcolaim filius Domnaill xi. annis regnavit. Cum exercitu suo Maelcolaim perrexit in Moreb, et occidit Cellach. In vii. anno regni sui predavit Anglicos ad amnem Thesis, et multitudinem rapuit hominum, et multa armenta pecorum: quam predam vocaverunt Scotti predam Albidosorum idem Nainndisi. Alii autem dicunt Constantimum fecisse hanc predam querens a rege, id est, Maelcolaim, regnum dari sibi ad tempus hebdomadis, ut visitaret Anglicos. Verum tamen non Maelcolam fecit predam, sed instigavit eum Constantinus, ut dixi. Mortuus est autem Constantinus in x. ejus anno sub corona penitenti in senectute bona. Et occiderunt viri na Moerne Malcolaim in Fodresach id est in Cladeom.

Indulfus tenuit regnum viii. annis. In hujus tempore oppidum Eden vacuatum est, ac relictum est Scottis usque in hodiernum diem. Classi Somarlidiorum occisi sunt in Buchain.

Niger alius Maelcolaim regnavit v. annis Fothach episcopus pausavit. [Bellum] inter Nigerum [et] Caniculum super Dorsum Crup, in quo Niger habuit victoriam: ubi cecidit Duchad abbas Duncalden et Dubdon satrapas Athochlach. Expulsus [est] Niger de regno, et tenuit Caniculus brevi tempore. Domnal filius Cairill mortuus est.

Culenring v. annis regnavit. Marcan filius Breodalaig occisus est in ecclesia Sancti Michaelis. Leot et Sluagadach exierunt ad Romam. Maelbrigde episcopus pausavit. Cellach filius Ferdalaig regnavit. Maelbrigde filius Dubican obiit. Culen et frater ejus Eochodus occisi sunt a Britonibus.

Cinadius filius Maelcolaim regnavit annis. Statim predavit Britanniam ex parte. Pedestres Cinadi occisi sunt maxima cede in Moin Vacornar. Scotti predaverunt Saxoniam ad Stannoir, et ad Cluiam, et ad Stangna Dera'm. Cinadius autem vallavit ripas vadorum Forthi. Post annum perrexit Cinadius, et predavit Saxoniam, et traduxit filium regis Saxonum. Hic est qui tribuit magnam civitatem Brechue Domino.

IV.—CRONICA REGUM SCOTTORUM CCC. ET IIIJ. ANNORUM.

Vide supra, p. 329.

(S. Colb. Bib. Imp. Paris, 4126.)

FERGUS filius Eric ipse fuit primus qui de semine Chonare suscepit regnum Alban, id est, a monte Drumalban usque ad mare Ilibernie et ad Incheagal. Iste regnavit iii. annis.

Domangrat filius ejus v. aunis.

Congel filius Domangrat. xxxiii.

Goueran frater Congel xxii. aunis.

Conal filius Congel xiiij. annis.

Edan filius Gonerau xxxiiij. annis.

Eochod flavus filius Edan xvi. annis.

Kinat sinister filius Conal iij. mensibus.

Fercar filius ejus xvi. annis.

Dovenald varius filius Eochid xiiij.

Fergar longus xxi.

Eochal habens curvum nasum filius Donegarth filii Doneual varii iij.

Arinchellas filius Ferehar longi i. anno.

Ewen filius Ferchar longi xiii.

Murechat filius Arinchellae iij. annis.

Ewen filius Mucerdaech iij.

Edalbus filius Eochal curvi nasi xxx.

Fergus filius Hedalbi iij.

Seluach filius Eogan xxiiij.

Fochal venenosus filius Edalbi xxx.

Dunegal filius Seluach vii.

Alpiu filius Eochal venenos iij.

Kynedus filius Alpini primus rex Scottorum xvi.

Dolfnal filius Alpini iij.

Constantinus filius Kinet xx.

Hed filius Kenet i. anno.

Grig filius Dunegal xii.

Duneval filius Constantini xi.

Constantinus filius Hed xxv.

Malcolm filius Duneuald ix.

Indolf filius Constantin ix.

Duf filius Malcolm iij. annis et vi. mensibus.

Culen filius Iudulf iij. annis et sex mensibus.

Kinet filius Malcolm xxii. annis et ii. mensibus.

Custantin filius Culen. i. anno et iij. mensibus.

Chinet filius Duf. i. anno et dimidium.

Malcolm filius Kinet xxx. Hic magnum bellum fecit apud Carrun. Ipse etiam multas oblationes tam ecclesiis quam clero ea die distribuit.

Macheth filius Findleg xvii.

Lulac nepos filii Boide iij. mensibus et dimidium.

Malcolm filius Dunecan xxxvii. et dimidium et iij. mensibus. Hic fuit vir Margarite regine filie nobilissimi. Matildis et Marie, sui generis celsitudinem conjugio, morum ingenuitate, scientie magnitudine, rerum temporalium larga in pauperes et in ecclesias dispensatione decenter ornaverunt. Matildis enim matrimonio juncta fuit Henrico Anglorum regi strenuissimo, qui de Francoru*m* excellenti regum prosapia duxit originem: quorum sublimitas predicti, scilicet, et regis et regine ad hoc usque perducta est, ut ipsorum soboles Romani imperii tenuerunt dignitatem. Eorum namque filia M. Prudencia forma diviciis digna imperio, imperatori nupsit Romano. Maria vero lege conjugii Eustachio comiti Boloniensi tradita, regina sorore non minor extitit probitate, licet regina caraerit potestate. Hujus itidem filia strenuum virum comitem Stephanum sponsum accepit de regali simul et consulari stirpe progenitum. Omitto filias adhuc viventes matres defunctas exemplo propono viventibus que cum secnli pompa quod raro invenitor divites sanctis extitere virtutibus pauperes utriusque sexus cujuscunque condicionis essent, ac si membra coluerunt Christi, religiosos clericos monachos sincero amore velud patronos et suos futuros judices cum Christo dilexerunt. Matildis

regina kal. majj migravit de hac vita. Anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXVIII. sepultaque est honorifice in ecclesia Beati Petri apostolorum principis Westmonasterii juxta Londoniam Anglorum urbem nobilissimam. Maria autem comitissa ii^o. kal. Junii anno ab incarnatione Domini MCXVI. apud Bermundseiam ex altera parte prefate urbis monasterio Sancti Salvatoris in pace quievit; ubi a domino Petreio admirande sanctitatis viro tunc priore ejusdem loci Cluniacensis sed ad caritatem specialiter pertinentis gloriose sepulta est. Tumulus vero marmoreus regum et reginarum ymagines habens impressas genus quiescentis demonstrat. In superficiem ejusdem tumuli titulus aureis litteris sculptus nomen et vitam et originem breviter ita comprehendit.

Nobilis hic tumulata jacet comitissa **Maria**.

Actibus hec nituit, larga benigna fuit.

Regum sanguis erat morum probitate vigebat.

Compatiens inopis, vivat in aree poli.

Edmundus vero frater earum vir strenuissimus et in Dei servicio. dum vitam ageret præsentem valde devotus apud Montem Acutum in quadam videlicet cella Cluniaceensi que ibi sita est requiescit humatus.

Dolfnal frater ejus regnavit annis iii. et vii. mensibus.

Dunchad filius Malcolin dimidium annum.

Eadgarus filius Malcolin ix. annis.

Alexander frater ejus xvii. annis et iii. mensibus.

David frater ejus xxx. Erat autem rex David vir piissimus, in religione catholicus, in principes munificus, in recuperandis basilicis studiosus, satis vigilis, et orationibus in tantum studens ut plus supplicationibus ad Deum profusus quam armis bellicis victoriam de inimicis optineret. Rex vero piissimus David multa dona fecit precipue tum edes sacras ubique in toto regno suo uectate collapsas conterat, pontificibus et patribus ad quorum curam pertinebant ut restaurentur imperavit: adhibens curam per legatos ut imperata perficerentur. Unde sub ejus imperio multa sunt reparata, immo funditur edificata monasteria. Sed he precipue, monasterium puellare Sancte Marie et m[onasterium] puellare S[ancti] N[icholai] et multa alia pueraria et cetera plurima utrinque videlicet sexus virorum et mulierum, quibus veluti quibusdam lichenis totum decoratur Scocie regnum. Que omnia ipse piissimus David rex magnus auri et argenti ponderibus gemmarumque preciosarum exornavit muneribus, amplissimis etiam honoribus dicavit; et insuper, quod preciosius est sanctissimis reliquiarum patrociniis insignivit. Has omnes idem rex potens et piissimus honorabiliter multis excolebat muneribus, sed Melrosensem precipue inter omnes ecclesias et fideliter defensabat et dulciter diligebat et suis opibus exornabat. Ceterum omnia ejus gesta que vulgo narrantur, non sunt hic propter vitandum fastidium legitimis pleniter explanata.

Malcolin filius filii David xii. annis et vi. mensibus et xiii. diebus.

Willelmus frater ejus.

Ab anno primo Willielmi regnum Scottorum anni CCCXV.

Willelmus rex rufus filius Henrici, filii David filii Maleolaim filii Donnchada, qui fuit nepos Maleolaim filii Cinada, filii Maeololaim, filii Domnail, filii Constantin, filii Cinacha, filii Alpin, filii Echach, filii Eda-find, filii Echadach, filii Echach, filii Domongrat, filii Domnail-bric, filii Echach-buide, filii Edan, filii Gabran, filii Domangrat, filii Fergus, filii Eire, filii Echach-muinremuir, filii Oengus-aphir, filii Fedelinthe-aislingig, filii Oengusa-buiding, filii Fedelinthe-ruannaich, filii Senchormaic, filii Cruitlinde, filii Findfece, filii Achircir, filii Achachantoit, filii Fiacrach-cathmail, filii Echdach-riada, filii Conore, filii Mogalanda, filii Luigdig, filii Ellatig, filii Corpre-crumpchimi, filii Dare-dornmoir, filii Corbre, filii Admoir, filii Conarre-moir, filii Eterscenil, filii Eogami, filii Elela, filii Jair, filii Dedaid, filii Sin, filii Rosin, filii Their, filii Rothir, filii Roin, filii Arandil, filii Manine, filii Forgo, filii Feradaig, filii Elala-arami, filii Fiachra, filii Firmara, filii Oengusa-turmig, filii Firce-chairroid, filii Ferroid, filii Firanroid, filii Firaibrig, filii Labchore, filii Echachalt-lechin, filii Elela-casiacraig, filii Conlaich, filii Erero, filii Moalgi, filii Cobthaig-coelbreg, filii Ugaine-moir, filii Eedaig-buadaig, filii Duach-lograich, filii Fiachraig-duadach, filii Duach-lograich, filii Fiachraig-tollgreich, filii Muredaich-bollgreich, filii Semoin, filii Brice, filii Emidinb, filii Edom, filii Glais, filii Nuadatfail, filii Elehada-olchaim, filii Sirna, filii Dem, filii Demail, filii Rodchada, filii Ogmaieh, filii Oengussa, filii Olmochada, filii Fiachracl-laibrinne, filii Finergnaid, filii Smereta, filii Enmocha, filii Tigernaig, filii Fallaig, filii Etheoir, filii Jair, filii Dermeom, filii Mele-despain, filii Bili, filii Nema, filii Brige, filii Brigoind, filii Bracha, filii Theacha, filii Erchada, filii Aldoit, filii Noda, filii Nonail hemir, filii Goildil-glais, filii Neuil, filii Fenius-farsaid, filii Eogani, filii Glunud, filii Laniud, filii Etheoir, filii Jair, filii Agmemnom, filii Thri, filii Boi, filii Sem, filii Mair, filii Esro, filii Aduir, filii Hieridach, filii Aoth, filii Sran, filii Esro, filii Boid, filii Riafich, filii Gomur, filii Jafeth, filii Noe, filii Lameth, filii Matus-salem, filii Enoch, filii Jarech, filii Malalethel, filii Cainan, filii Enos, filii Sed, filii Adam, filii Dei vivi.

V.—NOMINA REGUM SCOTTORUM ET PICTORUM. SERIES REGUM SCOTTORUM, FOL. 46.

Ex Registro Prioratus S. Andrea,¹ a folio 46 ad fol. 49.² Summa Regum xxiii. annorum ccxxvii. et 3 mens.³

1. Fergus filius Erth primus in Scotia regnavit tribus annis ultra Drumalban usque Sluagh⁴ muner et usque ad Inchegal.

¹ De excerptis hujus registri, *vide supra*, p. 330.

² Hec foliorum registri tam accurata notatio, que et servatur in aliis hujus Registri excerptis a V. Cl. D. Sybaldo ad me transmisses, probat primum exscriptorem hujusmodi excerptorum ipsum authenticum registrum ob oculos habuisse: etsi ab aliquot annis ipsum autographum, nescio quo casu, disparuerit.

³ In hoc numero ccxxvii. annorum xxiii. regum ab initio Fergusii ad exitum Alpini manifestus est error sive scriba, sive codicis ipsius; quemadmodum et sepiissime alias erratum est in notis numeralibus annorum regni horum regum.

⁴ I. Sluagh more.

2. Dovenghart fil. Fergus quinque ann. regnavit.
3. Congal fil. Dovenghart 24 an. regn.
4. Gauran fil. Doveughart 22 an. regu.
5. Conal fil. Congal 14 an. regn.
6. Edhan fil. Gauran 34 an. regn.
7. Heoghedbude 16 an.
8. Kinathkerr fil. Conal 3 mens.
9. Ferchar fil. Ewin 16 an.
10. Dovenald Brec fil. Heoghedbude 14 an.
11. Malduin fil. Dovenald Durn 16 an.
12. Ferchar-soda 21 an.
13. Heoghed Rinnavel fil. Dovenghart filii Dovenald Brec. 3 an.
14. Armkellet fil. Findan. 1 an.
15. Heatgan fil. Findan 16 an.
16. Murdochus fil. Armkellet 3 an.
17. Heoghan fil. Murdach 3 an.
18. Hethfin fil. Heoghed Rinnevale 30 an.
19. Fergus fil. Hethfin 3 an.
20. Sealuhanc fil. Eogagan 24 an.
21. Heoghed annuine fil. Hethfin 30 an.
22. Dungal fil. Heoghed annuine 7 an.
23. Alpin fil. Heoghed annuine 3 an. *Hic occisus est in Gallewathia, postquam eam penitus destruxit et devastavit. Et hinc translatum est regnum Scotorum in regnum Pictorum.*

NOMINA REGUM PICTORUM.¹

1. Crutheuse fil. Kinne elemens judex accepit monarchiam in regno Pictorum, et regnavit 50 annis.
2. Gede 101 an. regnavit.
3. Tharan 100 an. regn.
4. Duchil 40 an. regn.
5. Duordegel 20 an. regn.
6. Deootheth 60 an. regn.
7. Combust 20 an. regn.
8. Caranathrecht 40 an. regn.
9. Gernath-bolg. 9 an. regn.
10. Umpopnenet 30 an. regn.
11. Fiachua albus 30 an. regn.
12. Canatulme! 6 an. regn.
13. Dinornacht Netalec 1 anno.
14. Feodak Finleg 2 an.
15. Garnat-dives 60 an.
16. Talarg fil. Keoether 25 an.
17. Drust fil. Urb. 100 ann. rexit² et 100 bella peregit.
18. Talarg fil. Amil 2 an.
19. Nethan Thelecamot 10 an.

¹ De discrepantia hujus catalogi a cronica Pictorum tam in nominibus quam in numero regum, vide quæ dicta sunt supra, p. 84, etc.

² Exemplar Jacobi Gray ex iisd. S. Andreae monumentis, ut apparent, descriptum, habet 100 ann. *vixit*, non autem *rexit*. De hoc v. notam p. 92 supra.

20. Drust Gormot 30 an.
21. Galam 15 an.
22. Drust fil. Gigurum 5 an.
23. Drust fil. Hydrossig 8 an.
24. Ganut fil. Gigurum 6 an.
25. Kelturan frater ejus 6 an.
26. Golorg fil. Mordeleg. 12 an.
27. Drust fil. Moneth 1 anno.
28. Tagalad 4 an.
29. Brude fil. Melchon 30 an. Hune ad fidem convertit S. Columba.
30. Garnat fil. Domnach 20 an.
31. Nethan fil. Ub. 21 an. Hic ædificavit Abernethyn.
32. Kinel fil. Luthren 14 an.
33. Nectan fil. Fottle 5 an.
34. Brude fil. Fathe 5 an.
35. Telarg fil. Fetobar 11 an.
36. Talargan fil. Amfrude 5 an.
37. Garnat fil. Domnal 5 an.
38. Drust frater ejus 6 an.
39. Brude fil. Bile 21 an. Hujus tempore floruit S. Adamnanus.
40. Taram fil. Amfredech 14 an.
41. Brude fil. Derili 31 an.
42. Nectan frater ejus 18 an.
43. Garnath fil. Ferath 24 an.
44. Oengusa fil. Fergus 16 an.
45. Nethan fil. Derili 9 mens.
46. Alpin fil. Feret 6 mens.
47. Oengnsa fil. Brude 6 mens. Idem iterum 36 annis.
48. Brude fil. Tenegus 8 an.
49. Drust fil. Talargan 1 an.
50. Talargan fil. Drustan 4 an.
51. Talargan fil. Tenegus 5 an.
52. Constantin fil. Fergus 42 an. Hic ædificavit Dunkelden.
53. Hungus fil. Fergus 10 an. Hic ædificavit Kilrymont.
54. Dustalorg 4 an.
55. Eoganan fil. Hungus 3 an.
56. Ferat fil. Batot 3 an.
57. Brude fil. Ferat 1 mens.
58. Kinat fil. Ferat 1 mens.
59. Brude fil. Fotel 2 an.
60. Drust fil. Ferat 3 an. Hic occisus est apud Forteviot; secundum alios, apud Seonam.
- 24.¹ Kinath Mac-Alpin 16 an. Super Scotos regnavit, destructis Pictis; mortuus in Fortevioth; sepultus in Yona insula, ubi tres filii Erc, scilicet Fergus, Loarn & Enegus sepulti fuerant. Hic mira calliditate duxit Scotos de Argadia in terram Pictorum.

¹ Habetur in veteri codice Bibl. Cotton. [Vitellius, A. 20] exemplar hujus chronicorum regum Scotorum a Kenetho et deinceps.

25. Dovenald Mac-Alpin 4 an. mortuus in Raith in Veramont, sepultus in Yona insula.
26. Constantin Mac-Kinath 16 an. Interfectus est a Norwigensibus in bello in Merdo¹ fatha, sepultus in Iona insula.
27. Ed Mac-Kinet uno anno. Interfectus in bello in Strathalin a Girk filio Dungal, sep. in Iona.
28. Girk Mac-Dungal 12 an. Mortuus est in Dundurn, et sepultus in Iona. Hie subjugavit sibi Hyberniam totam et fere Angliam. Et hic primus dedit libertatem ecclesie Scoticane, quae sub servitute erat usque ad illud tempus ex² constitutione et more Pictorum.
29. Dovenal Mac-Constantin 11 an. Mortuus est in Fores, et sepultus in Iona.
30. Constantin Mac-Edha 40 an. Hie dimisso regno sponte Deo in habitu religiosis abbas factus Keledeorum S. Andreae 5 ann. et ibi mortuus est et sepultus.
31. Malecom Mac-Dovenaldi³ 9 an. Interfectus in Ulurn a Moraviensib.⁴ sep. in Iona.
32. Induiff Mac-Constantin 9 an. Interfectus a Nörwagensib. in Inverculan, sep. in Iona.
33. Duk Mac-Malcolm 4 ann. et 6 mens. Interfectus in Fores et absconditus sub ponte de Kildes; et sol non apparuit quamdiu ibi latuit.⁵ Sepultus in Iona.
34. Culin Mac-Induiff 4 an. et 6 mens. Interfectus ab Andarch filio Dovenald propter filiam suam in Laudonia.
35. Kinath Mac-Malcolm 24 an. et 2 mens. Interfectus in Fotherkern a suis per perfidiam Finelle filio Cunechat comitis de Angus; cuius Finelle filium uticum praedictus Kinath interfecit apud Dunfinoen.
36. Constantin Mac-Culin 1 an. et 6 mens. Interfectus a Kinat filio Malecolm i. in Rathveramoen, et sepultus in Iona.
37. Girgh Mac-Kinat-Mac-Duff 8 an. Interfectus a filio Kinet in Moeghanard, sep. in Iona ins.
38. Malcolm Mac-Kinath rex victoriosissimus 30 an. Mortuus in Glamis, et sep. in Iona insula.
39. Donechath⁶ Mac-Trini ablati de Dunkeld et Bethoe filiae Mal-com-Mac-Kinath 6 an. Interfectus a Macbeth-Mac-Finleg in Bothgouanan et sep. in Iona.
40. Macbeth-Mac-Finleg 17 an. Interfectus in Lunfanan a Mal-colm-Mac-Donehat et sepultus in Iona.
41. Lulach fatuus 4 mens. Interfectus est in Essei in Strathbolgi, et sep. in Iona.
42. Malcolm Mac-Donehat 37 an. et 8 mens. Interfectus in Inneraldan,⁷ sep. in Iona. Hie suit vir S. Marzaretæ.
43. Donald Mac-Donechat prius regnavit 6 mens. et postea expulsus est, et
44. Donekan Mac-Malcolm regnavit 6 mens. hoc interfecto a Mal-

¹ Wero fatha. ms. Cotton.² Consuetudine. ms. Cot.³ Servivit. ms. Cot.⁴ Per dolum. Cot.⁵ Et inventus est et Cot.⁶ Mac trivi. C.⁷ Juxta Alnwick. C.

- per Macloen comite de Moerns in Monachedin : rursum Donall Mac-Donechat regnavit 3 annis. Hic captus est ab Edgar Mac-Malcolm, cœcatus est et mortuus in Roscolpin, sepultus in Dunkeldeni, hinc trans-lata ossa in Iona.
45. Edgar 9 an. Mortuus in Dunedin, et sepultus in Dunfermling.
46. Alexander 17 an. et 3 mens. et dimidio. Mortuus in Crasell, sep. in Dunfermling.
47. David 29 an. et 3 mens. Mortuus in Carlede, sep. in Dunfermling.
48. Malcolm fil. Henrici filii David 12 an. et 6 mens. et 20 dieb. Mortuus apud Jedword, sep. in Dunfermling.
49. Willemus 52 an. Mortuus in Strivelin, sep. in Aberbrothok, cui successit
50. Alexander fil. Will. 34 an. et 8 mens. Obiit a^o 1243 in expeditione in quadam insula Erregethal, et sep. apud Melross, cui successit
51. Alexander filius puer septem annor. coronatus apud Seonam 3 id. Julii a Davide Epo. S. Andreæ 1251. Hic rex perexit in Angliam et honorifice susceptus est a rege Angliae, apud Eboracum factus est miles : et crastino die desponsavit regis filiam. Nescio quo infortuito Zabulo seminante discordiam inter magnates terrarum suarum, cancellarius et justiciarius Scotie apud regem Angliae accusati, ab officiis deprivati, et alii eorum loco substituti.
-

VII.—BREVE CHRONICON SCOTICUM SIVE CHRONICON RHYTHMICUM.¹

Ad calcem Scottichronicon ms. Collegii Scotorum Parisiensis.²

PROLOGUS.

Cum hujus præcedentis voluminis prolixitas, hominum quoque memoriae labilitas, et incerti temporis brevitas, non sicut universa quæ inibi scripta sunt animo scire multa cupientis, similiterque semel comprehendere; ideo mihi visum est pro ingenioli mei capacitate quadam inde extrahere; et in unius corpus codicilli quodam compendio³ scripto veteri metrico, et novo ad propositum respondentem, quasi sub quodam epilogo summatim religere, præcipue quæ facere videntur ad noticiam inelytorum regum Scotorum; de qua stirpe, quæve origine ad istas oras devenerunt; et quanto tempore, et quanto ante Pictos, cum hisdem, et post eos vicissim regnaverunt; et qualiter

¹ De hoc Chronico Rythmico vide quæ dicta sunt supra, p. 331, etc., p. 365.

² In hoc codice Parisiensi extat genuinum et minime interpolatum. Habetur etiam hoc idem Chronicon sive in initio sive ad calcem Scottichronicorum ms. Paslaten., in biblioth. Regia Londin., Collegi Edinburgense, Pancurense, Cartasiense, in bibl. Jurid. Edinb., Cuprensi, et aliis : sed in plerisque cum multis interpolationibus et additionibus, quorum aliquas infra notabimus : sicut et variae lectiones alicuius momenti.

³ L. Simul et semel, rectius, juxta cod. Pasl.

⁴ Partim ex metris veteribus, partim ex recentibus ad prepositum facientibus. Cod. Paslat.

nunc stirps Scotigena miscetur cum Saxonica, qualiterque Britannica stirpe multigena variatur, et quomodo rex Scociae modernus de jure debito, debet tam Angliae quam Scociae praeſici regnis.¹

PRIMA PARS CHRONICI.

QUO TEMPORE ANTE INCARNACIONEM CHRISTI INCEPIT SCOTA, A QUA SCOTIA.

QUISQUE loqui gaudet validus, de sanguine puro
 Quorundam precibus de Scotis dicere euro ;
 Unde sui generis, ortus primeus habetur :
 Quorum posteritas trans tempora perpetuetur.
 Quicquid narabo, per cronica scripta probabo
 De neterum gestis, reliquorum sum quia testis :
 Scribere nam volui, mihi que presentia vidi.
 Adam primeum non incipiam numerare,
 Quomodo nec dicam Noe cepit generare.
 Hoc genus a Japhet ejus nato juniore
 Quamvis descendat, referam tamen a propiore :
 Per quem dicatur stirps hec et magnificatur,
 Quingentis mille cum sexaginta monosque
 Annis ut reperi, precessit tempora Christi ;
 Agnus sub lege primus maetatus in ede.
 Biblia testatur quod tunc reuocare paratur
 Rex Pharaon populum, fugientem per mare rubrum ;
 Cujus rex Pharo mergitur in medio.
 Ex tunc Scotorum describam tempus et horum
 Progeniem referam, per tempora continuatam.

GAITHIELOS INTULIT LAPIDEM, C. ii.

Postquam passus erat Ipharo, miserable funus,
 Nobilis exierat ab Egipto Sithicus unus
 Exul, qui lapidem Pharaonis detulit idem :
 Ut liber fatur, Gaizilglas ille vocatur.
 Hic bis undenus fuit a Japheth alienus :
 Ut sic credatis, dat linea sanguinitatis.
 Naufraga nauigio qui plura pericula passus,
 Ad terram tandem venit sic equite lassus,
 Sed lapis hunc erexit, ipsum qui per mare vexit.
 Hic lapis, ut fatur, hec anchora vite vocatur.
 Cumque locum petiit securus ad residendum,
 Pluribus hunc annis Hispania cepit alendum,
 Cujus progenies nimis augmentatur ibidem,
 Sieut scriptura testatur condita pridem.

DE EODEM LAPIDE.

Post obitum regis Pharaonis mille duobus
 Annis, ut recolo, tunc quidam nomine Milo,

¹ Hic interseritur in plerisque Scotichronicis descriptio ætatuum mundi.

Rex Hispanorum, qui plures magnos habebat
 Natos, illorum tamen unam plus recolebat,
 Scilicet hiis Symon cognomine Brek fuit unus,
 Cui pater exhibuit quoddam prenobile munus,
 Scilicet hanc petram : Gaizilglas quam tulit equam,
 Perque fretum gessit, ab Egypto quando recessit.
 Milo prophetavit nato, qui quem recreauit
 Letare cepit, hanc petram quando recepit ;
 Quod sua regnaret stirps, hanc quoconque locaret.
 Ecce Deo dante sicut factum fuit ante,
 Sic fit in instante Symon Brec, quo mediante,
 Sic augmentante sobolis partem venientis
 Ad se suscepit Hibernia : quo residentes
 Annos per multos, horum quos vidiit adultos.
 Quosdam deduxit validus Lorimonie quidam
 Primus ad Ergadiam ; quo tempore concito dicam
 Isti sunt ducti, dicuntur postea Scotti.
 Nam velut a Gitia Geticus, seu Gothia Gothi,
 Dicitur a Sithia Sithicus, sic Scocia Scotti.
 Que prius Albania sic fertur Scocia terra.
 Scotti a Scota ; de Scottis Scocia nota :
 A muliere Scota vocatur Scocia tota.

QUOT ANNIS REXERUNT PICTI, C. iiiij.

Quod jam promisi, tempus sic ecce relisi :
 Bis bis centeno quater endeca, sed minus uno,
 Anno quo sumpsit primos Ergadia Scottos,
 Ut referunt isti, fuit incarnacio Christi.
 Annorum sumiam Pictis preoccupatorum,
 Hic dat Scotorum deca quinque centibinorum
 Et annos quindecim, tres menses jungito quidem,
 Tunc Scotti querunt anni quot preterierunt
 Postquam vicerunt Pictos, qui tunc coluerunt
 Albaniam, citra Drumalban, sed minus ultra ;
 Ut Scotti valeant memoratum tempus habere,
 Per Scociam totam quo ceperunt residere ;
 Qui Picti terram rexere mille ducentis
 Et pariter junctis viginti quatuor annis.
 Ut verum renonem, mensibus atque nouem.
 Pictis amotis, datur hec responsio Scottis ;
 D. semel et ter C. post X. ter et X. quater inde,
 Istorum numeri monstrat, quo tempore Christi
 Sed trans Drumalban cepit regnare Kenedus,
 Filius Alpini, Pictorum fronde perempti,
 In bello priden quos Alpin vicerat idem.
 Sed cum septenis Kaned regnauerat aunis,
 Nititur in Pictos, ulcisci funera patris ;
 Quosdam sternendo bello, quosdamque fugando.
 Ex tunc Albanie regnum totale regebat,

Que prius in parte regni dicta refidebat ;
Progenies cuius jus regni nunc tenet hujus.

PRIMUS REX REGNAUIT IN ARGADIA.

Ex annis Domini qui continue renonantur,
Apparet per quot annos Scotti dominantur :
Sic patet in genere de tempore sufficienter.
Reges nunc referam qui regnauere frequenter.
In tamen Ergadia vixit per tempora multa
Hec gens sub lege nature, sed sine rege,
Donec ad Ergadium tulit audax nomine quidam
Fergusius lapidem de quo fit mencio pridem.
Hic primo rexit Scotos, lapidem quia vexit.
Quem Scotti lapidem sanxerunt ponere sedem,
Regibus inde suis tantum, sed non alienis.

DE CONTINUACIONE REGUM USQUE AD KENEDUM.

Primus in Ergadia Fergus rexit tribus annis,
Post Donegard quinis, Congal quater octo bis,
Endeca bis Gouren, sed quatuor et deca Conal,
Quatuor et deca bis Edhan, x. sex Eogledbod,
Kynath Ker per tres rexit tantummodo menses,
Sed Ferquharth annos per quatuor et duodenos.
Bis septem Douenald, octo bis Maldoine annis,
Ter septem Ferard, tredecim sed rexit Eoged,
Armkellock uno, sed tredecim regnauit Eogain,
Rex Murdahw trinis, Noegaw uno quoque binis,
Hetfin per deca ter, Fergus tres sed Sealvanach
Quatuor et deca bis : sed Eogadaninque tricensis,
Dungal septenis, Alpinus sed tribus annis.
Annis septenis Kenedus filius Alpyn.
Hii cum predictis regnauerunt tempore Pictis,
Quod trecentenos quatuor octoque continet annos ;
Hiis annis et tres debetis jungere menses.

DE CONTINUACIONE REGUM SCOTORUM.

Et postquam Kenedus Pictos omnino fugauit,
Annos octo bis regnando continuauit.
Douenald Machalbyn post rexit quatuor annis,
Sed[ecim] Constantinus, Ed vno, Greg duodenis,
Donald vndenis, Constantin bisque vicenis.
Malcolmus primus, sic Maeduf, quisque nouenis ;
Sed Duf per senos menses et quatuor annos.
Per tantum Culen, sed Kened sex quater annis,
Mensibus et binis : Constantinusque per annum,
Et menses senos tantum, Greg octo per annos,
Malcolm per deca ter, Duncan sex, sed deca septem
Macbeth, sed Lahoulan per menses quatuor, atque
Malcolm Kenremor annos per ter deca septem,

Et menses octo : cuius frater Douenaldus
 Annos compleuit trinos regnando vicissim.
 Dnm Duncan medio sex menses tempore vixit.

DE HINC REGES SCOTORUM PROCESSERUNT DE STIRPE TAM SAXONUM.
 SIUE ANGLORUM, QUAM SCOTORUM.

Tune stirps Scotigena, Saxonum sanguine mixta,
 Cepit regnare ; quod propono reserare
 Qualiter hoc esset, ut quiuis discere possit.
 De dicto nati Kenremore tres generati
 Regnum rexerunt, quod successum tenuerunt,
 Quos Margarita peperit, regina beati,
 Heres Anglorum regum, regina Scotorum.
 Ex quo qui dubitat Anglorum cronica querat :
 Per quam coniugium Scotis prebetur in vsum.
 Non erat istorum generacio dico duorum
 Fratrum primorum ; genuit tamen ultimus horum
 Regia stirps, quorum successio nunc referatur.
 Annis ter trinis et trinis meisibus Edgar
 Primus regnauit de natis quos generauit
 Malecolmus cum dicta Margarita beata.
 Hinc Alexander annis rexit deca septem
 Meisibus atqne tribus, septimanisque duabus.
 Iste secundus erat fratrum ; sed tertius extat,
 Dauid, vicenis regnans annisque nouenis,
 Mensibus et trinus ; tunc Malcolm filius Henri
 Annis bis senis, et semis regna regebat.
 Ut rumor gessit hic Malcolm virgo recessit.
 At Heuricus erat natus regis quoque Dauid,
 Quem rex is Dauid ex Matilda generauit ;
 Heres que fuerat Hundingtonie comitatus,
 Cujus sic esset, si posset viuere natus ;
 Qui bello moritur de Cothon, sed sepelitur
 In abbacia nomine Calcouia.
 Hec Matilda datur de Sanlice, que tumulatur
 In Scona ; cuius templum bustum tenet hujus.
 Quadragesima ix. Willelmus rexerat annis,
 Cujus Willelmi genitor dictus fuit Henri ;
 Et pariter comitis de Dundle, nomine Dauid.
 Tres sibi sorores fuerant, Britan. comitissa,
 Que Margarita Conano conjugi data,
 Hee junior datur germana, sed altra vocatur
 Nobilis Adissa ; fuit hec Holand comitissa,
 Conjugioque datus erat huic de Rosse comitatus
 Morte preuentam Matildam dic, et innuptam.

DE NOBILI POLITICO ALEXANDRO IIJ.

Hactenus hec dicta noui per cronica scripta,
 A modo que noui scriptis describere voui.

Alter Alexander, quem rex Willelmus habebat
 Natum, ter denis annis et quinque regebat.
 Hie Alexander alium fertur genuisse,
 Hunc alium ternum pro certo dico fuisse.
 Ternus Alexander ter denis rexerat annis
 Et septem fere. Ve Scotis, qui earuere
 Principe tam grato, largo, mitique, beato,
 Qui quinquagenus regum fuit ordine primus.
 Hic princeps annos Domini post mille ducentos
 Atque nouem nouies, sed quatuor hiis superadde
 Kyngorn non rite persoluit debita vite,
 Scilicet Aprilis decimo quartoque Kalendas ;
 Quo decet exequias celebrari perficiendas,
 Ne valeant obitum monachi seruare sopitum,
 A quibus incolitur Dunfermelin, sed sepulitur.
 Tanti tumba viri studio meliore poliri
 Debuit, artificum si funus haberet amicnm.
 Post mortis morsum vertit dilectio dorsum,
 Finita vita finit amor, et ita,
 Corpus predicti regis sine prole relicti,
 Post annis fere septem Scotti dolnere.
 Quod regem vere tot aristis non habuere.

DE REGE ROBERTO BROIS.

Andree festo, Domini post mille ducentos
 Atque decem nouies, cum binis insimul annis,
 Seruando morem sibi sumpsit regis honorem ;
 Quem quinquagenum regum facit ordo secundum,
 Dehinc ex toto Johanne rege remoto,
 De Brois Robertus, regum de stirpe repertus,
 Suscepit in Scona regni Scocie diadema ;
 Hec in Aprilinas sexto sunt facta Kalendas.
 Promittunt veteres quod erit hic belliger heros,
 Qui sua rura nonans regna sudabit Scoticus ensis ;
 Corruit Angligena per eum gens non sine pena
 Actenus hii toti fuerant ut plebs sua Scotti ;
 Atque Deo dante sic amodo sic velut ante
 Est totum cenum cuius caput est alienum
 Sic populus cenus quando fit rex alienus.

DE ROBERTO BROIS.

De Brois Robertus, regum de stirpe regali.
 Bis deca rex Scotos regnauit quatuor annis,
 M. semel et ter C. bis et X. nouem superadde,
 Tunc rex Robertus bonus est de funere certus.
 Ante suam mortem genuit similem sibi fortem,
 Magnanimum Dauid Rex Robertus generauit.
 Hic rex regnanit deca terque nouem simul annis,
 Nullum superstes heredem corpore gignit.

Marjoria tamen soror ejusdem generauit
 Galtero Stewart Robertum rite secundum :
 Qui regnando decemque nouem felieiter annis
 Regem Robertum generauit denique ternum.
 Hie xvi. stetit annis, Jacobum quoque gignit
 Primuu, qui regit annis deca terque duobus ;
 Ac Jacobum nostrum genuit rex iste modernum
 Tempore scripture, tunc lector sit tibi cure
 Quod fuit annorum septemque decem numerorum
 Quem Deus exaltet, regnum regat, atque gubernet.

VII.—EXTRACT OF THE CHRONICLE OF ANDREW WINTON, PRIOR OF LOCHLEVEN. *Vide supra*, pp. 337, etc., and 367, etc.

Ex Cod. ms. Bibl. Cotton. [Nero, D. xi.] fol. 30.

FERGUS ERTHSONE fra him¹ syne
 Down descendand even be Lyne
 Into ye 5 and 50 gre²
 As evin recknand men may sie,
 Brought this stane within Scotland.³
 And first it set in Ycolmkil,
 And skune yairefter it was brought til:
 And yair it wes syn mony a day,
 Quhen Edward gert haif it away,
 King of England, and syne he
 Gert it sett in Lundyn be.
 Fergus Erthsone the first man
 Wes yat in our land began
 Before yat time⁴ yat ye Peythis
 Our kinrik was fra ye Scottis,
 And syne ye Peythis regnand were
 A thousand ane and sixty yheres ;

¹ I.e. Simon Breac, who, according to the tradition of the Scots, first brought the famous stone from Spain to Ireland, and placed it there, says Winton, as the charter of the kinrik. From this Simon to Fergus son of Erch there were, according to the old Scottish genealogy, about fifty-five degrees or generations.

² I.e. Degree.

³ 'Furst quhen he came and wan yat lande.'—Cod. Bibl. Reg. Lond.

⁴ Winton supposes here, and all along, that the Scots were long settled in Britain before the Picts. This opinion had taken rise long before upon an emulation with the Picts (*vide p. 299, supra*), and became by degrees common among the Scots, after the disappearance of the Picts under their own name, by the destruction or dispersion of many of them, and by the incorporation of the rest into one body of the people with the Scots. And we meet with a Scottish writer, in the time of King James IV. (a short chronicle in prose at end of Winton in Biblioth. Reg. Lond.), who tells us that Simon Breac himself came to Scotland, that the Scots came into Britain even before Brutus, and that at last the Picts came in. In short, this writer tells us that the number of kings of Scots in his time amounted to near sax score of kings. Thus we see the notion of an ancient settlement and monarchy, once it arose, went beyond all bounds.

And fra yis Fergus down be lyne
 Desceudand evin was be lyne
 Kenaucht, yat wes aught hundred yhere
 And thre and fourtie passit cleir
 Eftir the blessit nativite,
 Or regnand he begouth to be
 Fra ye Peythis was put out.
 The tend man without doubt¹
 Was Kenaught Malkalpyne
 Fra yis Fergus even be lyne :
 And swa ther ten should occupy,
 Gif al were reckynit fullely,
 Twelf hundred zheris and weil ma :
 Bot I cannot consaif it swa :
 Bot yat yis Fergus was regnand
 Within ye kinrick of Scotland
 And yai ten yat regnand were
 Eftir yis Fergus zhere be zhere,
 As yai yat ye Croniklis wrate,
 In till number sett ye date,
 Among ye Peythis wes regnand
 Withiu the kingdom of Scotland,
 And liffit in bargain and in weer
 Duhil Kenaucht rose weih his power,
 Gif oyir of mair suffisans
 Can fynd better accordance
 Yis buke at likyn yai may mende :
 Bot I now schortlie to mak ende
 Thinkis for to sett yair date,
 As Cronikles before me wrate, etc.

EXTRACT OF ANDREW WINTON'S CHRONICLE REVIEWED BY HIMSELF, WITH ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS. (Book iv. chap. 8.²)

Ex Codice ms. Bibliothecæ Regiae Londin. See p. 338, *supra*.

FOUR hundred winters and fifty³
 And twa to reckyn our even likely
 Before ye nativite, etc.
 As in our storie written is
 Yan in Scotland the Scottis
 Begouth⁴ to reign and to steer

¹ Winton repeats this again (fol. 43), that Fergus Erthson was first king of the Scots, and that before the entry of the Picts; but finding that there were but ten generations betwixt this Fergus and Kenneth-Mac-Alpin, which he acknowledges could not take up more than three hundred years, he concludes at last that the Picts were already settled in Scotland when Fergus Erthson came in, which, he says, he found by other sure authors.

² I have met with this succession of the kings of Scots from Fergus in none of the other copies of Winton.

³ L. forty. Cod. Cotton.

⁴ I.e. began.

Twa hundred full and fortie zhere
 Five winters and monethis three
 Gif yat all suld rekkonit be
 Or the Peythis in Scotiand
 Came in, and in it were dwelland.
 And now to thai¹ I turn my style,
 Of yair lynage to speke a while :
 As in the third buke² was before
 From Simon Brek till Fergus More
 Is as the Scottis lynally
 Come down of Irischery,
 Quhar yen I left now to begin
 Yair namis here I will tak in
 He yat was callet Fergus More
 In ye third buke ye hard before

- K. 1. Was Fergus Erthon yat thre yhere
 Maid him beyond ye Drum³ to steir⁴
 Oure all ye hlychtis evir ilkane
 As yai ly fra Drumalbane
 Till Stanemore⁵ and Inchegall
 Kyng he mad hym⁶ oure⁷ yaim all :
- K. 2. Dongart his swn yheris fyve
 Was tyll his father successyve
- K. 3. Congal Dongarts swn twentye zheres
 And twa was kyng withouttin weres :
- K. 4. Gowrran Dongarts swn alsua
 Regnyt twentie zheris and twa :
- K. 5. Conal nest⁸ him Makeongal
 Forteen zheres held yai landis all :
 Thretty wyntyrs and four yan
- K. 6. Edan regnyd Mak-Gowran :
- K. 7. Heocged bwd sex zheris and ten
 Kyng was in yai landis yan :
- K. 8. Kynat ker Mak-eolnal
 Three monethis held yai landis all :
- K. 9. Ferchar Maekony sexten zhere
 As king couth⁹ all the landis stere.
- K. 10. Donald-brek son Hucgedbuode
 Kyng was fourtene zheres proude¹⁰
 And eftir yat his dayis wes downe
- K. 11. Maldowny Dolnald Doynyswn
 Sexteen winters kyng was hale:¹¹
 And nest tuke yat governale
- K. 12. Ferchar fodys sune, and was yan
 Twentie wynteris kyng and ane :

¹ The Scots.

² *Winton*, book iii. c. 9. Cod. Bibl. Reg. Lond.

³ In the margin of the ms. is this note : ‘ Drum Albain, the back of Albany.’

⁴ To reign.

⁵ F. Sluaghmore.

⁶ Himself.

⁷ Over.

⁸ Next.

⁹ Could.

¹⁰ Powerful.

¹¹ Sixteen years whole.

K. 13. Heegede¹ monavele Mackdongat
 Downad Brekswn after yat
 Regnyd twelve zheris fullelie.
 Here I suspend yis genealogy :
 Bot I will speke mare yarof swae
 Quhen all ye laive² till yat is dwne.³

VIII.—INSTRUMENTUM⁴ PUBLICUM, CONTINENS COPIAM ET EXEMPLAR
 DE VERBO IN VERBUM QUARUNDAM LITERARUM EDWARDI REGIS
 ANGLIE SUPER RENUNCIATIONE ET QUIETA CLAMATIONE OMNIUM
 OBLIGATIONUM, JURIUM, FACTORUM ET CONVENTORUM FACTORUM
 INTER REGES SCOTIE ET ANGLIE, AUT SUORUM REGNORUM STATUS,
 SUPER SUBJECTIONE ET JURISCLAMIO REGIS SCOTIE ET IPSIUS
 REGNI. Et res est bene notanda.⁵

Ex ipso authentico instrumento in collegio Seotorum Parisiensi.
 Vide Prefationem, No. xiv. supra.

UNIVERSIS sancte matris ecclesie filiis, ad quorum notitiam presentes
 litere pervenerint, Henricus⁶ miseracione divina episcopus sancti
 Andree salutem in Domino sempiternam. Noverit universitas vestra,
 quod nuper eoram nobis pro tribunali sedentibus in capella juxta
 magnum pontem burgi de Perth nostre dioceos, constitutus rever-
 endus in Christo pater dominus Gilbertus,⁷ Dei gratia episcopus
 Abirdonensis, cancellarius Scocie, nomine, & ex parte trium statuum
 regni Scocie tunc congregatorum & consilium generale facientium in
 domo fratrum Predicatorum dicti burgi, quasdam literas recolende
 memorie domini Edwardi, Dei gratia regis Anglie, principis quondam
 inclitissimi produxit, nobisque exhibuit & ostendit; quarum tenores
 de verbo ad verbum inferius describuntur. Quas quidem literas idem
 dominus episcopus & cancellarius transcribi petiit, & exemplari ac in
 publicam & attenticam formam ad futuram rei memoriam redigi
 auctoritate nostra ordinaria, cum interpositione decreti, ne propter
 defectum probacionis eorum, que in ipsis literis continentur, dominus
 noster rex Scocie, qui pro tempore fuerit ac regnum & regnicole
 quovismodo inquietari vel perturbari valerent ipsis litteris originalibus
 perditis vel destrutis. Nos igitur volentes probacionibus subvenire,
 ne veritate occulta justitia deperiret, visis, lectis, & diligenter
 inspectis litteris ipsis in nostra presentia, de verbo ad verbum, per
 notarios publicos infrascriptos, nobis veris absque suspicione re-
 putatis, & cum originalibus examinatis, & sigillis in iisdem appensis
 integris, &, ut bene apparuit, veris. Ipsius domini episcopi & cancel-

¹ Enochd-rinavel.

² The rest.

³ The names of the following kings are intermixed with Winton's chronicle, and in all the ordinary copies, so it were useless to set them down here.

⁴ Hoc instrumentum servabatur olim in archivo sive tabulario ecclesiæ metropolitanae Glasguensis; inde eruptum (dum universa ecclesiarum regni tabularia, prætextu religionis, conflagrarent) a Jacobo Beaton archiepiscopo cum aliis ecclesiæ suæ chartis et instrumentis in Gallias deportatum est.

⁵ Haec nota alia manu additur titulo ut majori cura servaretur hoc instrumentum.

⁶ Henricus de Wardelau.

⁷ Gilbertus de Grenlæw.

larii petitioni, utpote rationabili, annuentes prefatas litteras transcribi & exemplari mandavimus & fecimus per notarios publicos infra-scriptos, tenore presentium decernentes quod transcripto hujusmodi sive exemplacioni deinceps per omnia plena fides adhibeatur, tam in judiciis quam extra, sicut originalibus litteris prelibatis: quibus omnibus & singulis nostram autoritatem interponimus & decretum. Tenores ipsarum literarum tales sunt. Universis presentes litteras inspecturis, Edwardus, Dei gratia rex Anglie, dominus Hybernie, & dux Aquitanie, salutem in domino sempiternam. Cum nos, nonnullique predecessores nostri, reges Anglie, jura regiminis dominii, seu superioritatis regni Scocie conati fuerimus obtinere, ob hocque motarum dira guerrarum discrimina Anglie & Scocie regna diutius afflixissent, nos attendentes cedes, occisiones, scelera, ecclesiarum destructiones, & mala innumerablelia, que hujusmodi occasione guerrarum regnicolis utriusque regni multipliciter contingebant, bona quoque quibus regnum utrumque mutuis compendiis habundaret, perpetue pacis stabilitate connexum, ac per hoc contra conatus noxios rebellare vel impugnare volentium interius vel exterius majori firmitate securum, volumus, & concedimus, per presentes, pro nobis, heredibus, & successoribus nostris, quibuscunque, de communi consilio, assensu, & consensu prelatorum & procerum, comitum & baronum, ac communiatum regni nostri in parlimendo nostro, quod regnum Scocie per suas rectas marchias prout temporibus bone memorie Alexandri regis Scocie ultimo defuneti fuerunt habite & servate magnifico principi domino Roberto, Dei gratia, regi Scotorum, illustri confederato ac amico nostro carissimo, suisque heredibus & successoribus divisum in omnibus a regno Anglie integrum, liberum & quietum remaneat in perpetuum, absque qualicunque subjectione, servitute, clameo vel demanda. Et si quod jus nos, vel antecessores nostri, in regno Scocie retroactis temporibus petierimus, vel petierint quo-quomodo, prefato regi Scocie, heredibus & successoribus suis, renunciamus, & dimittimus, per presentes. Omnes autem obligaciones, convenciones & pacta, initas, vel inita qualitercunque cum nostris predecessoribus quibuscunque, quibuscunque temporibus, super subjectione regni Scocie, vel incolarum ejusdem, per quoscunque reges vel incolas clericos, vel laicos ipsius regni Scocie, pro nobis, heredibus & successoribus nostris, remittimus penitus & omnino. Et si que littere, carte, munimenta vel instrumenta, reperiantur de cetero ubicunque super hujusmodi obligacionibus, convencionibus & pactis confecta vel confecta, pro cassis, irritis, inanibus & vacuis habeantur, nulliusque valoris esse volumus vel momenti. Et ad premissa omnia plene, pacifice & fideliter perpetuis temporibus observanda, dilectis & fidelibus nostris Henrico de Percy consanguineo nostro, & Willielmo la Zousch de Asheby, & eorum alteri, ad sacramentum in animam nostram inde prestandum, per alias litteras nostras patentes, plenam dedimus potestatem ac mandatum speciale: in cuius rei testimonium, has litteras nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Datum apud Ebor. primo die Martii, anno regni nostri secundo: PER IPSUM REGEM ET CONSILIJUM IN PARLIAMENTO. Item; Edwardus, Dei gratia, rex Anglie, dominus Hybernie, & dux Aquitanie, dilectis ac fidelibus suis

Henrico de Percy, & Willelmo de la Zousche de Asheby salutem. Cum per cartam, sive litteras nostras patentes, concesserimus magnifico principi Roberto, Dei gracia, regi Scotorum, quod habeat regnum Scocie per suas rectas marchias, prout temporibus bone memorie Alexandri regis Scocie ultimo defuncti fuerunt habite & servate ; & jus, si quod nos, vel antecessores, nostri in regno Scocie retroactis temporibus, petierimus, vel petierint quo-quomodo eidem domino regi Scotorum renunciaverimus. Nos de fidelitate vestra & circumspectione provida plenius confidentes, ad firmandum & vallandum omnia & singula in dictis carta sive litteris contenta per juramentum in animam nostram prestandum, vobis & alteri vestrum tenore presentium, committimus potestatem ac speciale mandatum. Et hoc omnibus, & singulis, quorum interest, vel interesse poterit, innotescimus per presentes litteras nostras patentes sigilli nostri munimine roboratas. Datum apud Ebor. primo die Martii, anno regni nostri secundo : PER IPSUM REGEM ET CONSILIJUM IN PARLIAMENTO. Sigillabantur autem dicte litere sigillo magno & rotundo de cera alba, in enjus una parte erat forma cathedre in qua erat ymago regis sedentis, induit quasi regalibus vestibus, cum corona in capite, & sceptro in manu dextra, & ex utraque parte cathedre flos lili; & in circumferentia scriptum erat litteris legibilibus : EDWARDUS, DEI GRACIA, REX ANGLIE, DOMINUS HYBERNIE, DUX ACQUITANIE. Ex altera autem parte sigilli erat ymago regis armati sedentis super equum, gladium ferentis evaginatum elevatum in manu dextra, & super humerum sinistrum erat scutum in quo erant tres ymagines leopardi gradientis ; and in circumferentia erat scriptum litteris legibilibus : EDWARDUS, DEI GRACIA, REX ANGLIE, DOMINUS HYBERNIE, DUX ACQUITANIE. In quorum omnium & singulorum testimonium presentes litteras, sive presens publicum instrumentum, per notarios publicos infrascriptos scribi & publicari mandavimus, nos trique sigilli fecimus appensione muniri. Datum & actum in capella supradicta, sub anno Domini millesimo quadragesimo quinto-decimo, mensis Martii die decima septima, indictione nona, pontificatus sanctissimi in Christo patris ac domini nostri domini Benedicti divina providentia pape XIII. anno vicesimo secundo, presentibus reverendis in Christo patribus & dominis dominis Willelmo Glasguensi, Henrico Moraviensi, Waltero Brechinensi, Thoma Candide-Case, Fynlao Dunblanensi, Alexandro Rossensi, & Alexandro Cathinensi, Dei gracia, episcopis ; Willelmo de Dumfermyne, Waltero de Abirbrothok, Joanne de Balmurinach, Willelmo de Kinlosse, Joanne de Culros, & Patricio de Cumbuskyneth, Dei gracia, Abbatibus, cum multis aliis testibus ad premissam publicationem videndam & audiendum vocatis specialiter & rogatis.

Et ego Ricardus de Crag, presbyter Sancti-Andree dioecesis publicus imperiali autoritate notarius de mandato dicti domini mei episcopi Sancti-Andree, & ipso autoritatem prestante, dictum instrumentum in publicam formam redegii, manu propria totum scripsi, nihil addito vel diminuto quod sensum mutet vel vitiet intellectum, & in presentia judicis & testium, cum magistris Patricio de Huyston canonico Glasguensi, Ricardo Knyth rectore

ecclesie de Conneth, & domino Waltero Ra rectore ecclesie de Garvalde notariis publicis, diligenter & fideliter cum ipso attento ascultavi, & ipsas originales litteras vidi, & testibus ostendi, & perlegi, non vitiatas, non cancellatas, nec in aliqua sui parte abolitas seu suspectus neque in casta, neque in scriptura, neque in sigillo ; premissisque omnibus aliis, & singulis, dum sic ut premittitur fierent & agerentur presens sui, & ideo hic me subscripti, signumque meum solitum apposui, rogatus & requisitus in fidem & testimonium omnium premissorum.¹

Et ego Ricardus Militis, clericus Sancti-Andree dioeces, publicus imperiali auctoritate notarius, premissis omnibus & singulis, dum sic ut premittitur coram prefato domino meo episcopo Sancti-Andree fierent & agerentur, una cum prenominatis testibus, presens interfui, eaque sic fieri vidi & audivi, & cum subscriptis notariis in notam recepi, & presens publicum instrumentum aliena manu scriptum de mandato dicti domini episcopi similiter publicavi, illudque una cum appensione sigilli dicti reverendi patris, signo & subscriptione meis solitis & consuetis signavi in testimonium premissorum requisitus & rogatus.²

Et ego Robertus de Ferny, clericus Sancti-Andree dioeces, publicus auctoritate apostolica imperiali notarius, omnibus & singulis suprascriptis, dum sic ut premittitur & coram prelibato domino episcopo Sancti-Andree fierent & agerentur, una cum subscriptis testibus presens interfui, eaque ut prefertur sic fieri vidi & audivi, una cum subscriptis notariis, presens publicum instrumentum aliena manu suprascriptum de mandato prefati domini episcopi publicavi, ac signo meo solito & consueto, una cum sigilli predicti reverendi in Christo patris munimine signavi : ideo me hic manu propria subscripti, rogatus & requisitus coram testibus notariisque supradictis in testimonium veritatis omnium & singulorum premissorum.³

Huic instrumento appensum est sigillum magnum Henrici de Wardelau episcopi S. Andree.

ADDITION.

The printer wanting matter to fill up this sheet, I thought nothing could be more proper than some authentic pieces that I have quoted and referred to in this essay, upon occasion of the rebellion against King James III. and of his murder ensued upon it.⁴ The first is the act of the Proposition of the Debate of the Field of Striveling, which is the first precedent of any act made in Scotland to justify the rising in arms against the sovereign, and which hath ever since been referred to by all those that have imitated the example of the authors of it. The second is a Bull of Pope Innocent VIII.⁵ granted at the instant supplication of those that had any hand in that rebellion,

¹ Signum Notar.

⁴ *Vide p. 150, and p. 163, etc., supra.*

² Sign. Notar.

³ Sign. Notar.

⁵ *Vide p. 163, supra.*

empowering the abbots of Pashly and Jedword to absolve them from that crime, and from the excommunication they had incurred by it, upon their hearty repentance, and promise to do, for expiation of it, whatever penance should be enjoined them. Both these acts are quoted and referred to in the relation of this tragedy, and serve to give light to the subject.

IX.—THE PROPOSITION OF THE DEBATE OF THE FIELD OF STRIVELING.

From the Acts of Parliament, commonly called the Black Acts, printed by Lekprevik, fol. 82.

Parl. K. James the IVth, 6th October 1488, cap. 14.

ITEM, in yis present parlament our soveraine lord beand present together with his three estaitis of the realme, was proponit the debait and cause of the field of Striveling, in the quhilke unquhile James king of Scotland, quhom God assolize, father to our soveraine lord happenit to be slane, and the cause and occasion thairof commonit, openit and arguit among the lordis of the three estaitis, John lord Glamis presentit and schew certaine articlis subscrubit with the said unquhile K. James hand, the tenor of the quhilke followis, &c. The quhilkeis beand read and schawin that the said articlis was diverse timis grantit to, and brokin be perverst counsal of diverse personnis beand with him for the tyme: quwhich counsalit and assistit him in the inbringing of Englishmen, and to the perpetual subiectioune of the realme, and under desait and colour maid and refusit, and that our soveraign lord that now is ever consentit for the gude of the realme and the profit thairof. (For the quhilke the earl of Huntlie, the earl of Errol, the earl Marshal, the lord Glamis, and utheris diverse barons, and utheris the kyngis true liegis left him, and his desaitfull and perverse counsale, and adherit to our soveran lord that now is, and his true opinion for the common gude of the realme) the quhilke mater being shawin examinat and commonit, and understanding be the three estaitis and haill bodie of the parlament, they rypelie avisit, declarit and concludit, and in thair lauteis and allegiance ilk ane for himself, declarit and concludit: that the slaunchter done and commitit in the field of Striviling, quhair our soveran lordis father happenit to be slane, and utheris divers his baronis and liegis, was alluterlie in their default, and culourit dissait done be him and his perverst counsale diverse tymes before the said field: and that our soveran lord that now is, and the trew lordis and baronis that wes with him in the samin field, war innocent, free, and quyte of the said slaunchters done in the said field, and all pursuite of the occasioune and cause of the samin: and that part of the three estaitis forsaidis, prelatis, bishopis, great baronis, burgessis, gaif thair seillis heirupon, together with our soveran lordis greit seill, to be schawin and producit to our H. Father the pape, the kingis of France, Hispanzie, Denmark, and uther realmis, as sall be sene expedient for the tyme.

X.—SCRIPTUM INNOCENTII PAPÆ VIII. QUO FACULTATEM IMPERIT ABSOLVENDI EOS QUI IN JACOBUM REGEM III. INSURREXERANT & DE PERPETRATO CRIMINE AB INTIMIS SE DOLERE PROTESTABANTUR, &c.

Ex Collect. C. de Panmure.

INNOCENTIUS episcopis servus servorum Dei dilectis filiis de Pasleto & de Iedworth Glasguen, dioces. monasteriorum abbatibus & cancellario ecclesiae Glasguenis salutem & apostolicam Benedictionem. Exuberans apostolicae sedis clementia recurrentium ad eam post excessum cum humilitate personarum statui libenter consulere, eisque se propitiam exhibere consnevit atque benignam. Exhibita siquidem nobis nuper pro parte nonnullorum regnicolarum regni Scotiae petitio continebat, quod olim, postquam per nos intellecto quod nonnulli domini tam spirituales quam temporales dicti regni adversus claræ memoriae Jacobum tertium ipsius regni regem, illiusque statum insurgere, imo & regem ipsum a dicti regni regimine expellere intendebant & moliebantur: nosque per quasdam literas nostras, nonnullas sententias, censuras & poenas ecclesiasticas, etiam privationis dignitatum & beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum; neconon ad illa inhabilitationis, contra ipsum regem insurgentes, & eorundem insurgentium fautores promulgaveramus: quae post modum in partibus illis promulgatae fuerunt, nonnulli regnicolæ ejusdem regni carissimo in Christo filio nostro Jacobo quarto ejus filio moderno regi, tunc principi Scotiae, qui pro salute & utilitate defuncti regis & regni prædictorum, statum & consilium ipsus regis reformare, & quosdam regis prædicti consiliarios vi & potentia expellere deliberaverunt, adhaeserunt, & illius fautores extiterunt: ac pro parte tam defuncti quam moderni regum prædictorum, exercitus parati fuissent & inter se manus conseruissent, præfatus rex defunctus in conflictu cum diversis aliis personis occupabuit, nonnullis ex præfatis exponentibus in dicto conflictu præsentibus; & alias aliquotiens ipsi regnicolæ qui prætextu duntaxat dicti conflictus contra ipsum regem defunctum insurrexerant. Unde tam præsentes quam absentes adhærentes, & alias contra dictum regem defunctum insurgentes præfati, dubitant sententias, censuras, and poenas incurrisse. Cum autem, sicut eadem petitio subjungebat, exponentes præfati de præmissis ab intimis doleant, cupiantque pro commissis pœnitentiam agere salutarem, pro parte ipsorum nobis fuit humiliter supplicatum, ut ipsos a sententiis, censuris, & poenis præfatis in ipsis litteris nostris quomodolibet contentis absolvere, ac alias ipsis & eorum statui in præmissis opportune providere de benignitate apostolica dignaremur. Nos igitur attentes quod præfatæ sedis clementia ad eam recurrentibus post excessum cum humilitate personis, suæ pietatis gremium favorabiliter aperire consuevit, ac volentes prædictos, apud nos alias de probitatis & virtutum meritis commendatos, horum intuitu favoribus prosequi gratiosis, eorum in hac parte supplicationibus inclinati, discretioni vestræ per apostolica scripta committimus & mandamus quatenus vos, duo, vel unus vestrum omnes & singulos qui in dicto conflictu interfuerunt, ac absentes qui illis adhaeserunt, & auxilium, consilium

assensum & favorem verbo vel facto quoquomodo præstiterunt, nec non qui alias quam prætextu duntaxat dicti conflictus contra ipsum regem defunctum insurrexerunt, & contra dictas nostras litteras quovismodo devenerunt, ac si eorum nomina & cognomina præsentibus insererentur, si hæc humiliter petierint, ab omnibus & singulis censuris & pœnis in dictis nostris litteris quomodo libet contentis, & per eos præmissorum occasione qualitercumque & quotiescumque incursis, quas ac si litteræ prædictæ de verbo ad verbum insertæ forent præsentibus habere volumus pro expressis, auctoritate nostra hac vice duntaxat absolvatis in forma ecclesiæ consueta, injunctis ipsis & eorum euilibet, pro modo culpæ pœnitentia salutari, & aliis quæ de jure fuerint injugenda; eosque & eorum singulos unitati sanctæ matris ecclesiæ, & sacramentorum ecclesiasticorum participationi, communionique fidelium, eadem auctoritate restituatis. Non obstanti-bus præmissis, ac constitutionibus & ordinationibus apostolicis, cæterisque contrariis quibuscumque. Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum anno incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quadringentesimo nonagesimo primo 5to kalend. Julii pontificatus nostri anno septimo.

THE END.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY



0035523921

941
H629
8

1

NOV - 1956

